Health Consultation

Public Comment Release

Analysis of Human Exposure Pathways for Pesticide Use
in Churchill County

FALLON LEUKEMIA PROJECT

FALLON, CHURCHILL COUNTY, NEVADA

JULY 18, 2003

Comment Period End Date: **August 25, 2003**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Public Health Service
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation
Atlanta, Georgia 30333

Health Consultation: A Note of Explanation

An ATSDR health consultation is a verbal or written response from ATSDR to a specific request for information about health risks related to a specific site, a chemical release, or the presence of hazardous material. In order to prevent or mitigate exposures, a consultation may lead to specific actions, such as restricting use of or replacing water supplies; intensifying environmental sampling; restricting site access; or removing the contaminated material. In addition, consultations may recommend additional public health actions, such as conducting health surveillance activities to evaluate exposure or trends in adverse health outcomes; conducting biological indicators of exposure studies to assess exposure; and providing health education for health care providers and community members.

The Public Comment Period is an opportunity for the general public to comment on Agency findings or proposed activities for this written consultation. The purposes of the comment period are to
1) provide the public, particularly the community associated with a site, the opportunity to comment on the public health findings, 2) evaluate whether the community health concerns have been adequately addressed, and 3) provide ATSDR with additional information. There will be a time period for written comments, which will run until August 25, 2003. Please address correspondence
to the Chief, Program Evaluation, Records, and Information Services Branch, Division of Health Assessment and Consultation, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Fallon Leukemia Project, 1600 Clifton Road, NE (E60), Atlanta, Georgia 30333.

The conclusions and recommendations presented in this health consultation are the result of site specific analyses and are not to be cited or quoted for other evaluations or health consultations.

You May Contact ATSDR TOLL FREE at
1-888-42ATSDR
or
Visit our Home Page at: http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov

HEALTH CONSULTATION

Analysis of Human Exposure Pathways for Pesticide Use
in Churchill County

FALLON LEUKEMIA PROJECT

FALLON, CHURCHILL COUNTY, NEVADA

Prepared by:

Exposure Investigation and Consultation Branch
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry

Table of Contents

FIGURES

TABLES

1.0 Background and statement of issues

In July 2000, the Nevada Department of Human Resources, Nevada State Health Division (NSHD), identified an increase in the incidence rate of acute lymphocytic leukemia (ALL) in children from Churchill County, Nevada. Most leukemia cases were in or near the city of Fallon, the largest population center in the county. Approximately 7,540 persons live in Fallon and about 24,000 persons live in the surrounding unincorporated parts of Churchill County that comprises a 5,000 square mile area (Bureau of the Census 2000).

In March 2001, NSHD requested that the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) and the National Center for Environmental Health (NCEH) evaluate environmental risk factors that might be linked to the childhood leukemia cluster in the Fallon, Churchill County, Nevada, area. NCEH designed and conducted a cross-sectional exposure assessment of selective contaminants using environmental (household) and biologic specimens for case-families and a reference population (Nevada Department of Human Resources 2001).

ATSDR and NCEH developed a Public Health Action Plan (PHAP) to evaluate environmental pathways for available sampling data, data gaps, and potential human exposures. These pathways include groundwater, air, soil, surface water, sediment, and biota (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2001).

Among the community concerns was the potential association of agricultural pesticide usage with leukemia. This health consultation evaluates potential exposure to pesticides in Churchill County and any associations between pesticide exposures and childhood leukemia (primarily ALL). Exposures to other chemicals are evaluated in separate reports.

The term *pesticide* encompasses a broad group of chemicals used to prevent, control, or eliminate insects, weeds, fungus, and bacteria. Pesticides are categorized by the type of pest they are intended to control. Specific types of pesticides include insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides. Pesticide use is common throughout the United States and occurs both inside and outside the home. Exposure to pesticides is a complex process that may occur from multiple sources through several different pathways and routes (Figure 1). Sources refer to the location and purpose of pesticide use and include:

- Pesticides used to control insects inside buildings or to control insects and weeds in lawns and gardens. The buildings can be homes, stores, offices, or industrial facilities as well as public buildings. Lawns and gardens can be at these locations; parks, golf courses, and athletic fields can be included.
- Pesticides used in farming to control weeds and insects.
- Pesticides used to control mosquitoes.
- Pesticides used to control weeds in other public places such as roads or public lands.

All of these sources are common in Churchill County. Pesticides are used for agriculture, to control weeds along roadways and irrigation canals, and to control mosquitoes. In general, pesticides are also used in the home to control insects and in lawn and garden applications.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimates that one billion pounds of pesticides (based on active ingredients and excluding disinfectants, sulfur, and oils) were used in the United States in 1997. About 77% of these pesticides were used for agriculture; 12% for industrial, commercial, and government purposes; and 11% for home and garden applications (U.S.EPA 2002b).

Pathways of exposure refer to the movement of the pesticides from the location of use to points where human exposure can occur. Pesticides can move through the environment during or after application indoors and outdoors, and can move through the air, water, or with the soil.

Pesticides can enter human bodies by three different routes of exposure: inhalation, skin contact, or ingestion. Inhalation exposure can occur during pesticide applications or when pesticides vaporize after application. Persons can come into direct skin contact with the pesticides during application or when a residual is left on surfaces that people contact. An example is kitchen surfaces where pesticides may settle after intentional spraying of areas like the baseboards or cracks and crevices. Persons also come into contact with pesticide residues on or in food items.

In a pesticide exposure study of children in Yuma, Arizona, researchers found that floor dust (presumably through ingestion) was the major medium (68.8%) by which young children were exposed to organophosphates, followed by solid food (18.8%), and beverages (10.4%) (O'Rourke and others 2003). In 2000, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) sampled 1,035 food items from across the country and found that DDT was the most detected residue (21% of samples) with concentrations ranging from 0.0001 to 0.062 parts per million (ppm). Malathion and methyl-chlorpyrifos were respectively the second and third most commonly found residues (detected in approximately 18% of the food items analyzed) with residue concentrations ranging from 0.0003 to 0.078 ppm malathion and 0.0002 to 0.086 ppm methyl-chlorpyrifos (FDA 2002).

1.1 Quality Assurance and Quality Control

In preparing this report, ATSDR relied on laboratory results in the referenced documents. The agency assumes quality assurance and control measures for the data were followed with regard to chain of custody, laboratory procedures, and data reporting. The validity of analyses and conclusions drawn in this document is determined by the reliability of the information referenced in this report. A quality assurance project plan (QAPP) and quality assurance evaluation of the project was not available to ATSDR for the sampling data used. Hence, some uncertainty is introduced into our evaluation.

2.0 Discussion

ATSDR evaluated pesticide exposures in Churchill County using the following data:

- **Blood and urine samples** were analyzed for pesticides as part of the NCEH Cross-sectional Exposure Investigation (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2003). Study participants consisted of children with ALL and their families, as well as matched controls. A total of 14 case families and 51 matched comparison families (205 participants) were included in this study. Questionnaire data collected as part of this investigation were also used.

- **Indoor dust and residential yard soil samples** were analyzed for pesticides as part of the NCEH Cross-sectional Exposure Investigation. The samples, collected by the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP), were collected at 80 current and former residences of the case and comparison families (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Environmental Health Division of Environmental Hazards and Health Effects Health Studies Branch 2003).

- **Pesticide use in Churchill County by governmental agencies and the agricultural industry** was identified through interviews with the Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District (Abatement District), Nevada Department of Agriculture, Truckee-Carson Irrigation District (TCID), and Frey-Spray, Inc. These interviews provided information on:
    - Agricultural pest and weed control
    - Irrigation canal weed control
    - Mosquito control
    - Noxious weed control
    - Roadside weed control

  Information on agricultural pest and weed control was also obtained from the state pesticide-use database of the Nevada Department of Agriculture containing information about commercially applied pesticides for agriculture. This database contained the date of use, county of use, land owner/applicator, product applied, application rate, number of acres, crop applied, and target pest.

2.1 Blood and urine data

NCEH reported blood and urine data as part of the NCEH Cross-sectional Exposure Investigation. This investigation analyzed blood and urine samples for 31 non-persistent* and 11 persistent pesticides or pesticide metabolites in 205 participants from 14 case families (families whose children had childhood leukemia) and 55 comparison families. NCEH compared the results to the *Second National Report on Human Exposure to Environmental Chemicals* (National Exposure Report) (Department of Health and Human Services 2003). Samples were collected from August through October 2001. This investigation also included use of questionnaires to collect data on the families' use of pesticides in the home, lawn, and garden.

Results show that five nonpersistent pesticides were found at levels significantly above National Exposure Report data (defined by detections above their respective 95th percentile National

---

* Pesticides can be categorized on the basis of their half-life as non-persistent, degrading to half the original concentration in less than 30 days; moderately persistent, degrading to half the original concentration in 30 to 100 days; or persistent, taking longer than 100 days to degrade to half the original concentration. A "typical soil half-life" value is an approximation and may vary greatly because persistence is sensitive to variations in site, soil, and climate ((National Pesticide Information Center (NPIC) 1999).

Exposure Report reference value) in more than 10% of the Churchill County urine samples (Table 1). These pesticides included one organophosphate pesticide (chlorpyrifos), one organophosphate metabolite (diethylthiophosphate), two chlorinated phenol pesticides (2,4,5-trichlorophenol and 2,4,6-trichlorophenol), and a fungicide (o-phenylphenol). NCEH also identified one aromatic hydrocarbon pesticide at slightly higher than the reference value (2-naphthol).

Among 11 persistent pesticides analyzed, NCEH found only 1,1-dichloro-2,2-bis(*p*-chlorophenyl)ethylene (DDE) to be significantly above the National Exposure Report reference value. DDE is a breakdown product of 1,1,1-trichloro-2,2-bis(*p*-chlorophenyl)ethane (DDT) and 1,1-dichloro-2,2-bis(*p*-chlorophenyl)ethane (DDD), which were detected but were not elevated above the National Exposure Report mean value.

NCEH also found the geometric mean level of hexachlorobenzene in the Churchill County study population lower than national level of less than the detection limit. However, the National Exposure Report used an instrument detection limit (60.5 nanograms/gram [ng/g] of lipid) that was substantially higher than the mean level measured in Churchill County (10.5 ng/g of lipid). This means an accurate comparison between Churchill County and the National Report is not possible.

NCEH also used conditional logistic regression analyses to compare exposures between case and comparison families. For most pesticides, the number of participants with detectable levels of pesticides was insufficient to calculate odds ratios and p-values. However, for persistent and non-persistent pesticides and metabolites with sufficient numbers of participants to be analyzed, no statistically significant association could be found between pesticide exposure and the occurrence of leukemia.

These results provide information only about current exposures. If exposure to a chemical caused a child's cancer, that exposure would have to have occurred several years before the diagnosis. Past exposures are evaluated in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.4.

2.2 Indoor dust and residential yard soil samples

Indoor dust and residential yard soil samples were analyzed for pesticides as part of the NCEH Cross-Sectional Exposure Investigation. NDEP collected the samples from September through February 2001 at 80 current and former residences of the case and comparison families. Samples were analyzed for heavy metals, persistent and nonpersistent pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and radionuclides. Only the pesticide results are discussed here. Residential surface soil was analyzed for 49 pesticides (Table 2) and indoor dust samples were analyzed for 45 pesticides. Four fewer pesticides were analyzed in the indoor dust samples (guthion, isophorone, Sevin, and methamidophos) because of analytic difficulties.

Overall, 26 pesticides were detected for residential surface soils. The most prevalent pesticides were cis- and trans-chlordane, DDE, diazinon, and heptachlor epoxide. With the exception of diazinon, all these are persistent pesticides and have been banned from use in the United States since 1988 or earlier (DDE is a breakdown product of DDT which was banned in 1972). The Nevada Department of Agricultural database indicates that these pesticides were not used commercially for agricultural purposes (Nevada Department of Agriculture 2002).

The most prevalent indoor dust pesticide found was N,N-diethyl-3-methylbenzamide (66 of 72 homes). Also know as DEET, this compound is the active ingredient in many insect-repellent products including those that are applied directly to human skin. The second most prevalent indoor dust pesticide found was diazinon (65 of 72 homes). Diazinon is used on home gardens and farms to control a wide variety of sucking and leaf eating insects. It is also used on rice, fruit trees, sugarcane, corn, tobacco, potatoes, and on horticultural plants. It is an ingredient in pest strips and is used to control fleas and ticks on pets (Pesticide Information Project 1996b). Additional information on indoor dust and yard soils is included in the ATSDR Pathway Assessment for Churchill County Surface Soils and Residential Indoor Dust (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2003b).

As with the blood and urine data, these results provide information about current exposures.

2.3 Pesticide use

Interviews with the Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District (Abatement District), Nevada Department of Agriculture, the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District (TCID) and Frey-Spray, Inc. provided information on pesticide use in the county with regards to

- Agricultural pest and weed control
- Irrigation canal weed-control measures
- Mosquito abatement
- Noxious weed control
- Roadside weed control

2.3.1 Agricultural pest and weed control

Agricultural commodities produced in Churchill County include forage, grains, vegetables, melons, alfalfa, dairy, livestock, and bedding plants. The most prevalent crop is alfalfa with approximately 31,000 acres in 1994. (Owens and others 1996). Alfalfa is a perennial plant and can be harvested up to three times per year in Churchill County. Herbicides are generally used early in the growing season before alfalfa begins growing. Afterwards, herbicide may be used throughout the growing season around the periphery of the fields. Insecticides will generally be used from end of May through August (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2001a; Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2003c).The growing season ends in October. The pesticides used are described below.

In Nevada, 31.7% of all herbicides are applied through aerial application for the control of weeds on alfalfa, and about 66% of all pesticides for control of insects on alfalfa crops and for mosquito control are applied through aerial application (Nevada Cooperative Extension Service 1991). In Churchill County, insecticides were used on alfalfa and other crops on 83,117 acres in 1992 and 79,049 acres in 1997. Herbicides were used on crops and pasture on 60,958 acres in 1992 and 109,474 acres in 1997 (U.S.Department of Agriculture 1999).

The Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDOA) requires notification of commercially applied pesticides (both restricted- and general-use pesticides) in Churchill County and Nevada for agricultural and structural uses. NDOA maintains a database of commercially applied pesticides for agricultural use. The database begins in 1970 and includes dates of use, county of use, land owner/applicator, product applied, and the purpose of treatment or crop treated. Since 1994, the application rate and the number of acres treated have been added to the database. The most used chemicals (by number of acres applied) in Churchill County back to 1994 are shown in Tables 3 (herbicides), 4 (pesticides), and 5 (mosquito abatement). The fact that data on the number of acres applied were available beginning in 1994 in relation to the age of most children with leukemia in Churchill County make 1994 a reasonable date to begin evaluating historic exposures.

Herbicides were used on a variety of crops, including alfalfa, oats, corn, and barley (Table 3). Pursuit® was the most used herbicide followed by Oust and Velpar (Nevada Department of Agriculture 2002).

Insecticides (excluding mosquito control) were used mostly on alfalfa (Table 4). Paraspray (ethyl parathion) was the most used insecticide followed by dimethoate and Furadan (carbofuran) (Nevada Department of Agriculture 2002).

Information on mosquito abatement as performed by the Churchill County Mosquito & Weed Abatement District is described in Section 2.3.3. The NDOA database also shows that the Naval Air Station Fallon controlled for mosquitos using predominately malathion, pyrethrin, and methoprene (Table 5) (Nevada Department of Agriculture 2002).

2.3.2 Irrigation canal weed-control measures

The Truckee-Carson Irrigation District (TCID) uses prescribed burns and herbicides to control weeds in the irrigation supply system consisting of 200-to-400 miles of canals and laterals. The main canals and laterals are supplied with water every year from approximately March 15th to November 15th. However, the actual dates for the water season depend on the weather. The canals are empty of irrigation water during the rest of the year (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2001b).

TCID conducts prescribed burns to clean main canals and laterals of accumulated dead vegetation. Burning activities begin in early January or February, depending on the weather, and can continue until the beginning of the water season in mid-March. Of the nearly 350 miles of canals managed by TCID, fewer than 150 miles (or 175 acres) are typically subjected to burning each year (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2002b). Health implications of the burning activity are described in the ATSDR report Air Exposure Pathway Assessment for the Fallon Leukemia Cluster Investigation (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2003a).

Beginning in late May and continuing throughout the water season, herbicides are applied as spot treatments for noxious weeds along the banks and edges of canals and laterals. Spot spraying typically occurs once or twice during the growing season at any single location. A herbicide-and-water mixture is used for spot spraying. Herbicides in the mixture are Rodeo©, a non-selective herbicide, and Weedone® for broadleaf control. Rodeo© (active ingredient n-phosphono-methylglycine glyphosate isopropylamine salt) is also used in September, October, and November to clear vegetation (principally willows) in main canals and laterals (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2002a). The active ingredients in Weedone® are 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) and butoxyethyl ester.

During the irrigation season from 1995 through 2001, TCID used Magnacide® H (EPA Reg. No. 10707-9; active ingredient acrolein; 92% by weight minimum) to control submerged aquatic weeds, specifically Sego pondweed. TCID typically treated a 10-mile section of canal by adding an approximate one-gallon mixture of Magnacide for each cubic foot per second of canal water to achieve an approximate concentration of 9 ppm in the water. This treated water was then delivered to a farmer's field but not used in any wetlands area because acrolein is toxic to wildlife. In 2001, TCID conducted four treatments on a total of 40 miles of ditch (Overvold 2001; Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2002a)

Acrolein was not included in any available water-quality analyses for samples collected in Fallon. One historic sample was collected in 1993 in the Carson River upstream of Fallon and acrolein was not detected (detection limit of 20 micrograms per liter [µg/L]).

Acrolein is rather unstable in the environment with a relatively short half-life. The half-lif e in air is 15-20 hours, and the half-life in surface water is 1-6 days. A substantial amount of acrolein is removed from surface water and soil through volatilization.

Acrolein is rather unstable in the environment with a relatively short half-life. The half-life in air is 15-20 hours, and the half-life in surface water is 1-6 days. A substantial amount of acrolein is removed from surface water and soil through volatization. Exposure to air levels greater than 0.17 ppm can cause eye irritation. ATSDR found no definitive studies on the carcinogenic effects of acrolein in humans or animals. Exposure during swimming in the canals is most likely rare since it is very unlikely that people would be swimming during the very infrequent use of acrolein. In addition, the amount ingested would also be too small to cause health effects. Exposure via groundwater may exist but degradation rates are likely to be too rapid for this to occur.

2.3.3 Mosquito abatement

Since 1986, the Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District (the Abatement District) has conducted mosquito abatement efforts. From 1960 to 1986, other county departments treated sporadically for mosquitos. The Abatement District addresses mosquito control for all parts of the county except for property associated with the Fallon Naval Air Station (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2001b).

The mosquito season runs from February or March until October. During the spring season (from April or May until July 4th), mosquitoes are of particular concern in the area northwest of Fallon. They also begin emerging in other areas as well. Because of lower costs and greater ease of application, the preferred control agent involves ground treatment with liquid, pucks, or granules containing larvicide (Vectobac or methoprene). However, once flying mosquitoes emerge (April, May, and June), trucks and airplanes are used to apply dibrom, and trucks are used to apply Pyrenone™ (active ingredients are pyrethrins) (Figure 2). Scourge™ (active ingredient resmethrin) was used instead of Pyrenone™ before 1994 (Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District 2001a; Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District 2003).

Use of the Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDOA) database of pesticides in Churchill County includes entries for mosquito abatement activities. These pesticides are listed in Table 5 and described in Section 2.3.1.

2.3.4 Noxious weed control

The Nevada Department of Agriculture, through the Nevada Weed Action Committee, coordinates and facilitates local, county, state, and federal agency programs and projects for the control and management of noxious and invasive weeds in Nevada. Under Nevada law, owners or occupiers of land in Nevada have the obligation and responsibility to control all weeds designated as noxious by the Nevada Department of Agriculture (Nevada Department of Agriculture 2001).

Noxious weeds can be controlled by various techniques including pesticides, which can be implemented by government agencies and individuals. ATSDR learned through interviews about the Tall Whitetop Weed Control Project, which was implemented in Churchill County by the Abatement District. From 1999 through 2001, the Abatement District applied the herbicide Weedar 64 (active ingredient is 2,4-D) along the Carson River to control tall whitetop. Spraying was done from the water’s edge to the adjacent roadway or up the bank if no road was present -- a distance of 20 to 40 feet. (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2001b).

2.3.5 Roadside weed control

State and local agencies provide roadside weed control in Churchill County to prevent pavement destruction, maintain visibility, and control noxious weeds. The Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) conducts routine pre-emergent herbicide application along state roads (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2001b). The Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District (Abatement District) applies herbicide treatments along county roadways and some state roads. As a supplemental treatment method, the Abatement District also conducts a limited amount of prescribed burning to remove roadside weeds (Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District 2001b).

Since 1998, the Abatement District has applied herbicides along certain county roads (Figure 2). These treatment applications occur in two parallel zones. In the first zone, located from the edge of the roadway out a distance of 3-4 feet, the Abatement District uses a full-spectrum herbicide (Arsenal, active ingredient imazapyr-isopropylammonium) to kill all plants, including grass. In the second zone, located from the edge of the first zone to private property lines, the Abatement District uses broad leaf control agents (Weedone LV6 with a dilute mixture of Glyphos; active ingredients 2,4-D and glyphosate, respectively). The Abatement District also conducts spot spraying along state roads for noxious weeds such as puncture vine using the Weedone/Glyphos mixture (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2001b). In the spring, the Abatement District uses Pendulum (active ingredient pendimethalin) as a pre-emergent herbicide.

2.3.6 Inert ingredients

Although inert ingredients can be toxic, ATSDR did not evaluate them in this report because most data on pesticide use in Churchill County did not include manufacturer names or formulations. Pesticide products contain both "active" and "inert" ingredients. Since 1947, the terms "active ingredient" and "inert ingredient" (also called “other ingredients”) have been defined by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). An active ingredient prevents, destroys, repels, or mitigates a pest, or is a plant regulator, defoliant, desiccant or nitrogen stabilizer. By law, the active ingredient must be identified by name on the label together with its percentage by weight. For this health consultation, ATSDR reviewed only “active” ingredients.

An inert ingredient is simply any ingredient in the product that is not intended to affect a target pest. For example, in some products isopropyl alcohol may be an active ingredient and antimicrobial pesticide; however, in other products, it is used as a solvent and may be considered an inert ingredient. Unless an inert ingredient is determined to be highly toxic, identification by name or percentage on the label is not required, but the total percentage of such ingredients must be declared. Neither FIFRA nor the regulations define the term "inert ingredient" on the basis of toxicity, hazard or risk to humans, non-target species, or the environment. Since 1987, EPA has had policies to reduce the potential for adverse effects from the use of pesticide products containing toxic inert ingredients (52 FR 13305) and has a program to evaluate their toxicity.

2.4 Exposure reconstruction

The use of biologic and environmental sampling data is one method of evaluating pesticide exposures. However, the available sampling data may not allow for an adequate assessment of exposure during the etiologic period for disease (Brody JG and others 2002). Of particular concern are the exposures of pregnant women and their fetuses because little is known about the potential developmental hazards of such exposures (Berkowitz and others 2003) (Perera and others 1999).

Because children in the Churchill County leukemia cluster are now three years of age or older, environmental exposures before 1999 or 2000 may be important. To identify past exposures, ATSDR conducted interviews and reviewed the agricultural database. These sources provide information about the types of products used and in some cases the locations and amounts. ATSDR then investigated whether past exposures could be deduced by using this information together with a mathematical model that predicts the movement of pesticides in the environment. The possible outcome from this effort would be to predict possible historic air and soil pesticide concentrations.

Because many different pesticides and herbicides as well as different methods of applications were used, ATSDR initially approached this work by focusing on a reasonable worst-case range of exposures. ATSDR selected a range of model inputs that were expected to encompass the different operating and meteorologic conditions and to produce a range of results including maximum concentrations.

ATSDR selected aerial rather than ground application as the source of pesticide exposure. Drift of airborne pesticides from the target site at the time of aerial spray application (spray drift) is a source of concern because this technique represents the highest potential for off-target loss (Bird and others 1996) and exposure of residential populations bordering or within the application area. Willis and McDowell (1987) in (Bird and others 1996) report that 20% or more of the sprayed pesticide may move off the field site through the air during the initial pesticide application. In Nevada, 31.7% of herbicides are applied through aerial application for the control of weeds on alfalafa and about 66% of pesticides for control of insects on alfalfa crops and for mosquito control (Nevada Cooperative Extension Service 1991).

Once spray drift occurs, direct and indirect exposure can occur. Direct exposures can occur through inhalation. The spray drift will also land on downwind surfaces (deposition). From deposition, indirect exposures may occur from ingestion via food, drinking water, or contact with soil or dust (Brody JG and others 2002). For this evaluation, ATSDR reviewed direct inhalation of airborne pesticides and ingestion of soils contaminated from pesticide deposition because they have the potential for the greatest exposures.

This exposure reconstruction consisted of three parts:

- Review of pesticide use.
- Modeling of pesticide aerial spraying from a single spray event of a hypothetical 40-acre field to calculate potential air and soil concentrations.
- Assessment of the modeled concentrations for potential health effects.

2.4.1 Review of pesticide use

From the review of pesticide use, ATSDR selected two pesticides/herbicides to represent the range of products used. Although ATSDR has estimates of the acres on which pesticides were applied, the exact locations are not known. ATSDR estimated the locations three different ways.

The first method used Churchill County property parcel data and land-use information. The parcel data included land-use categories of agricultural, residential, commercial, and industrial (Figure 3). Figure 4 is a close-up of the city of Fallon with these categories. One could assume that pesticides are applied to all agricultural fields. In many cases, agricultural fields (and possible pesticide use) and residential areas are located near each other.

The second method was to link the property owners listed in Churchill County property parcel data with those listed in the Department of Agricultural pesticide-use database. The results are shown in Figure 5. A limitation of this method is that many people listed in the agricultural pesticide-use database were not found in the property parcel map. In addition, a person may own several properties, and it may not be known to which property the pesticide was applied. The figure shows that several agricultural plots are close to residential areas.

The third method was through interviews. Because we were interested predominately in aerial applications of pesticides, we interviewed the main crop-dusting company and the Churchill County Mosquito & Weed Abatement District because they would be involved with most of the pesticides applied for agricultural use or weed and mosquito control (Figure 2). This figure also shows that areas in which pesticides were used are close to residential areas.

Because of the complexity and uncertainty of the locations, ATSDR used a hypothetical 40-acre field for analysis.

2.4.2. Modeling of pesticide aerial spraying from a single spray event of a hypothetical 40-acre field to calculate potential air and soil concentrations.

ATSDR used the AgDRIFT® Aerial Spray Drift Model to predict the downwind air and soil concentrations from the unintended drift of pesticides applied aerially (Bird and others 2002; Esterly 2002). The model scenario was the aerial spraying of a hypothetical 40-acre field by a typical crop dusting using standard boom and nozzle arrangements. Guidance and implementation on the modeling was conducted by David Esterly of Environmental Focus, Inc. and supplemental support was provided by Leonard Young of Eastern Research Group. Details of the modeling are provided in Appendix A.

The AgDRIFT® model inputs are grouped into four categories: meteorologic, equipment setup, application parameters, and product physical properties. The modeling focused on input parameters that have been shown to have the greatest effects on pesticide drift. These key inputs are selected using a “worst-case" scenario concept and are set to reflect upper limits of allowable or reasonable operating conditions. The remaining parameters that have less effect on drift are based on regional best-management practices, or model defaults.

Results of the AgDRIFT model are primarily a function of the distribution of liquid droplet size ejected from the spray nozzles, water content of the spray mixture, ambient temperature and humidity, and wind speed. Results are independent of the chemistry of the pesticide or herbicide, but a function of initial concentration of non-volatile components of the spray tank mixture (U.S.EPA 1997). Pesticides and herbicides are generally non-volatile. To model each pesticide and herbicide used in Churchill County would be a lengthy task that would not provide specific information. Therefore, ATSDR modeled two compounds to represent the range of pesticides and herbicides reported. The herbicide and insecticide products used in the model were represented by Gramoxone® Extra (paraquat dichloride), a relatively dilute application, and Parathion 8 EC (ethyl parathion), a relatively concentrated application. Drift was predicted using the AgDRIFT® 2.0.05 model employing site-specific inputs. The set of regional conditions available in the model was modified to reflect the range of meteorologic conditions one would expect in the Fallon, Nevada, area during the normal application season (Esterly, David M. 2002).

The model was run using 12 different scenarios, 2 different chemicals, 3 drop-size distributions (fine, fine-medium, and medium), and 2 different wind speeds (5 and 10 miles per hour) to determine the sensitivity of the model and to ensure a "worst-case" scenario (i.e., greater exposure). The 12 different scenarios were:

Gramoxone-5 mph wind
- Fine drop-size distribution
- Fine-medium drop-size distribution
- Medium drop-size distribution

Gramoxone-10 mph wind
- Fine drop-size distribution
- Fine-medium drop-size distribution
- Medium drop-size distribution

Parathion 8 EC-5 mph wind
- Fine drop-size distribution
- Fine-medium drop-size distribution
- Medium drop-size distribution

Parathion 8 EC-10 mph wind
- Fine drop-size distribution
- Fine-medium drop-size distribution
- Medium drop-size distribution

Modeling Results
Model results are air concentrations or deposition amounts downwind for each of the 12 scenarios. For example, for one scenario, the air concentrations in micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m$^{3)}$ are:

Maximum air concentrations (µg/m^3) of Gramoxone Extra			
Distance downwind (ft)*	Drop-size distribution class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	22.583	8.308	5.736
1,500	7.840	2.732	1.781
2,500	4.491	1.589	0.990
5,000**	2.297	0.788	0.470
10,000**	1.151	0.387	0.221

µg/m^3 micrograms per cubic meter
* 5 miles per hour wind speed
**Downwind distances of 5,000 and 10,000 feet are extrapolated values.

The particle diameters range from 76 microns to about 518 microns (see Table 2 in appendix A for details.)

ATSDR combined results of the 12 scenarios and selected maximum, average, and minimum concentrations to represent the potential range of air concentrations. The air concentrations are plotted in Figure 6. From this figure, a range of possible air concentrations for any pesticide can be determined as a function of distance from the sprayed field.

A similar process was completed for deposition. An example of the AgDrift deposition results is shown below.

Ground deposition (mg/cm²) of Gramoxone Extra* -			
Distance downwind (ft)	**Drop-size distribution class**		
	Fine	**Fine - Medium**	**Medium**
500	3.35E-04	1.37E-04	9.85E-05
1500	8.54E-05	3.28E-05	2.18E-05
2500	3.45E-06	1.11E-05	7.96E-06
5000	4.02E-06	1.07E-06	8.21E-07
10000	1.65E-07	6.86E-08	4.96E-08

mg/cm^2 milligrams per square centimeter
*5 miles per hours wind speed

Instead of a concentration in $\mu g/m^3$, the model results are an amount of pesticide deposited in milligrams per square centimeter (mg/cm^2). Because the exposure evaluation requires a concentration per unit mass of soils, ATSDR converted the deposited amount per area to a concentration per volume of soil by assuming that the deposited pesticide mixes 1 cm deep with soil, with an average soil density of 1.56 grams/cm^3. The soil density is based on data for Churchill County from the U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service (2002).

As with air concentrations, ATSDR combined results of the 12 deposition scenarios and selected maximum, average, and minimum concentrations to represent the potential range of soil concentrations. The soil concentrations are plotted in Figure 7. From this figure, a range of possible soil concentrations for any pesticide can be determined as a function of distance from the hypothetically sprayed field. For example, air and soil concentration at two downwind distances -- adjacent to the field (about 5 to 6 feet) and ¼ mile away -- are shown below with a range to represent differences from the different pesticide or herbicide dilutions, wind speeds, and droplet size distributions.

Concentration ranges of pesticides or herbicides in air and soil at two distances from sprayed field, pesticide exposure study, Churchill County, NV, 2001

Distance downwind from field	Concentration range (average)	
	Air ($\mu g/m^3$)	**Soil (mg/kg)**
5.5 (10 meters)	32 to 819 (244)	0.7 to 3.7 (1.8)
¼ mile (about 2,400 meters)	2.8 to 83 (24)	0.079 to 0.69 (0.29)

$\mu g/m^3$ micrograms per cubic meter
mg/kg milligrams per kilogram

Air concentrations represent the maximum 1-hour-average air concentrations that would occur at specified distances downwind after a spray event. Model assumptions indicate that air concentrations would return to background levels after one hour. Soil concentrations represent total pesticide deposited from spray drift. Soil concentrations would decrease over time through either natural degradation or movement if the soil is disturbed (e.g., by wind, plowing, or rain).

2.4.3. Assessment of modeled concentrations for potential health effects.

ATSDR's approach to evaluating potential health effects from pesticides has two components. The first involves a screening process that may indicate the need for further analysis. The second involves a weight-of-evidence approach that integrates estimates of likely exposure with information about the toxicology and epidemiology of the substances of interest.

Screening is a process of comparing appropriate environmental concentrations and doses to ATSDR or EPA comparison values. These comparison values include

- ATSDR Environmental Media Evaluation Guides (EMEGs).
- Reference Media Evaluation Guides (RMEGs) which are derived from EPA reference doses.
- Minimum Risk Levels (MRLs) based on dose in units of mg/kg/day.
- Cancer Risk Evaluation Guidelines (CREGs).
- EPA Reference Concentrations (RfCs).
- EPA Reference Doses (RfDs).
- Risk-Based Concentrations (RBCs) developed by EPA.

These health-based comparison values (CVs) are considered "safe" media-specific concentrations, using default conditions of exposure. Default conditions are typically based on estimates of exposure in most (i.e., the 90^{th} percentile or more) of the general population. Comparison values are not thresholds of toxicity. Rather, they are levels at which ATSDR believes even long-term exposure of sensitive populations would not result in an increased likelihood of developing adverse health effects. When a level is above a comparison value, it does not mean that health effects could be expected – it does, however, represent a point at which further evaluation is warranted.

Comparison values are based on a variety of toxicologic and exposure assumptions that might or might not reflect actual exposure conditions and the risk of adverse health outcomes. If warranted, ATSDR evaluates several parameters, depending on the contaminant and site-specific exposure conditions. Such parameters can include biologic plausibility, mechanisms of action, cumulative interactions, health outcome data, strength of epidemiologic and animal studies, and toxicologic and pharmacologic characteristics. These evaluations also consider noncarcinogenic health effects (e.g., heart disease) and carcinogenic health effects (e.g., leukemia). In general, a common non-carcinogenic health effect of most organophosphate pesticides include transient decreases in cholinesterase levels that affect transmission of information between nerves cells. This effect sometimes results in temporary neurologic disorders.

For this evaluation, ATSDR used the air and soil concentration at ¼ mile downwind from the hypothetical agricultural field as a general population estimate of exposure. Using the location adjacent to a field (5 to 6 feet) is not a realistic scenario because, at this distance, a person would practically be standing under the plane during the spraying, which is not realistic. ATSDR focused on the top 24 pesticides that were used (Table 6).

Exposures to pesticides in soil and in air were reviewed differently. Exposure to pesticides in soils was considered chronic exposure (exposures with durations of 1 year or more) because soils are relatively immobile and can be contacted repeatedly. Air concentrations were treated as acute exposure because of the short duration of drifting air-spray plumes.

Soil concentrations

Soil concentrations predicted by the model range from 0.079 to 0.69 ppm at ¼ mile downwind from a hypothetical 40-acre field. This is similar to the range of pesticide concentrations detected in residential soils (0.0087 to 0.628 ppm). However, a direct comparison is not necessarily appropriate because sample locations are at different distances from agricultural fields, the fields that used pesticides varied, and the model does not consider natural degradation, which is relatively fast for organophosphates (the principal type of pesticides in use). The process of degradation could mean that soil concentrations in the residential soil samples were higher at one time. Precisely how high could not be calculated because the source of pesticides in soil is not known.

ATSDR compared the highest predicted soil concentrations at ¼ mile downwind (0.69 ppm) to soil comparison values for the 24 most used pesticides (Table 6). All predicted concentrations were below screening values except for methyl parathion of 0.6 ppm based on pica behavior (the childhood behavior of eating a large amount of soil). Although the predicted range exceeds the comparison value slightly, it will not likely present a public health threat because pica behavior does not typically occur daily. An alternative screening value of 20 mg/kg [ppm], based on non-pica chronic behavior in children, may be more realistic and is much greater than the predicted soil concentration.

ATSDR evaluated data on indoor dust and residential soil sampling in the previously released report Pathway Assessment for Churchill County Surface Soils and Residential Indoor Dust, Churchill County, Nevada (ATSDR 2003b). The report reviewed data collected on samples analyzed for 49 pesticides and found that all pesticides detected in residential surface soil were found at levels below available screening levels except for one compound (Table 2). At one residence, dieldrin (detected in 4 of 79 homes) was found at 0.19 ppm. Although this level slightly exceeds the ATSDR chronic oral EMEG for pica children (0.1 ppm), it is not expected to present a public health threat because pica behavior does not typically occur daily and the non-pica chronic oral EMEG for children is 3 ppm.

Indoor dust was sampled for 45 pesticides, and overall 10 pesticides were detected. From these results and comparisons to soil screening values, ATSDR does not expect any adverse health effects in children or adults from exposure at the pesticide levels found in indoor dust (ATSDR 2003b).

Air concentrations

Air concentrations were treated as an acute exposure (exposures that have a duration of 14 days or less) because exposures from aerial spraying would be of short duration with the drift of sprayed pesticides assumed to pass within one hour. ATSDR reviewed these exposure in relation to carcinogenic (specifically childhood leukemia) and noncarcinogenic health effects.

Short-term acute exposures may be an important factor in the cause of long term health effects such as childhood leukemia. Despite extensive research, the etiology (cause and development) of childhood cancer is largely unknown. Considering the early onset of many childhood cancers, especially acute lymphocytic leukemia (ALL), which is the most common in children ages 2 to 5, risk factors occurring very early in life, during pregnancy, or even during conception must be considered (Feychting and others 2001). There are studies which suggest that exposure to household pesticides during critical time periods such as preconception, during pregnancy and postnatal periods, as well as parental occupational exposures to pesticide are risk factors for childhood leukemia, but these studies have a number of limitations, such as a small number of cases, low response rates, and uncertainties in existing data (Zahm and Ward 1998). Attempts to measure exposure levels after diagnosis is confirmed, may pose a research bias. The NCEH cross-sectional exposure assessment questionnaire was used to identify past exposures and did not show an increased risk between pesticide use in the home and presence of childhood leukemia. Considering the published work and NCEH results, it is not clear how short-term single or periodic exposures (acute exposures) of pesticides can effect initiation or promotion of childhood leukemia. Because of these uncertainties, there is a compelling need for further evaluation by the scientific community in the relationship between pesticide exposure and childhood leukemia (Ma and others 2002).

In general, ATSDR found limited information about the carcinogenic health effects of pesticides. Table 7 summarizes some of the known information. All of these compounds have been tested on animals and the evidence of carcinogenicity ranges from negative or no evidence to limited evidence. Some studies are inadequate or provide insufficient information to draw conclusions about a compound's carcinogenicity. Data on human carcinogenicity is much more limited than on animal studies. Most of the compounds have no data. Table 7 also shows the cancer classification given to each pesticide by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), EPA, and the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists. Most of the compounds are not classified because these agencies have not reviewed them (indicated by "—" in the table) or the data do not provide sufficient information for a determination (IARC = 3, EPA = D, ACGIH = A4). Four compounds have been classified: 2,4-D, paraquat dichloride (Gramoxone), alachlor (Lasso), and methyl parathion. 2,4-D has a IARC cancer classification of 2B indicating that it is a possible human carcinogen but the ACGIH classification of A4 indicates that there is a concern about its carcinogenicity but there is a lack of data to draw a conclusion. Research on the carcinogenicity of 2,4-D has shown conflicting evidence. Paraquat dichloride and methyl parathion have been classified by EPA as possible human carcinogens. Alachlor has been identified a probable human carcinogen by EPA while IARC and ACGIH have not reviewed it. These classifications are not adequate to evaluate the pesticides relationship with childhood leukemias.

ATSDR evaluation of noncarcinogenic health effects focused on acute health effects because of the acute pesticide air exposures that could occur from spray drift. However, ATSDR does not have non-worker, health-based, **acute** ambient air comparison values (i.e., inhalation MRLs or RfCs) for these pesticides. EPA Reference Doses exist for several pesticides but they are not applicable because they are based on chronic exposures (exposure of 1 or more years at a time). Therefore, ATSDR used worker-based permissible exposure limits (PELs) and worker-based threshold limit values (TLVs) and adjusted the evaluation accordingly. PELs and TLVs are intended to protect healthy adult workers from non-carcinogenic effects of chemical exposures that occur 8-hours a day and 5-days a week. PELs and TLVs were divided by 10 to account for the potential increased sensitivity of children and sensitive adults. ATSDR also used acute screening values of the California Department of Pesticide Registration for dimethoate, a manufacturer-suggested PEL/TLV for imazethapyr, and a Temporary Emergency Exposure Limit (Level 0) for ethyl parathion. These values are shown in Table 8.
To compare the predicted pesticide air concentrations to TLVs and PELs, ATSDR converted the 1-hour air concentrations to 8-hour averages by dividing the concentrations by 8. These spray events are assumed limited to a few fields at a time that are spaced far enough apart so that no one individual would be exposed more than once over a long period of time (months or years). The 8-hour-average air concentrations are shown below.

Calculated 8-hour minimum, average, and maximum air concentrations of pesticides and herbicides one-quarter mile downwind

	Air concentration ($\mu g/m^3$)
Minimum	0.35
Average	3.0
Maximum	10.4

$\mu g/m^3$ micrograms per cubic meter

The predicted 8-hour **average** air concentration did not exceed any of the screening values in Table 8. The **maximum** predicted 8-hour concentration of 10.4 $\mu g/m^3$ was below all screening values except for five compounds: disulfton, Furadan 4F, naled, paraquat (dichloride), and parathion (ethyl). The screening value for disulfton, Furadan 4F, naled, and paraquat (dichloride) is 10$\mu g/m^3$, which is slightly below the maximum concentration. Because the two values are close and the concentration is the maximum of a potential range, the concentration is most likely to be lower and will not likely cause adverse health effects.

For parathion (ethyl), the maximum 8-hour air concentration of 10.4 $\mu g/m^3$ exceeded the screening value of 5 $\mu g/m^3$[†]. Because the screening value was exceeded, we evaluated parathion further by analyzing the modeling results. Because parathion was one of the two pesticides we used in the AgDrift air model, we had exact modeled air concentrations instead of ranges of concentrations as used for the other pesticides. Therefore, at ¼ mile from the hypothetical field,

† Based on a TLV of 0.05 mg/m^3 (2003 American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists [ACGIH] update) with a safety factor of 10 and conversion from milligrams (mg) to micrograms (µg).

the model predicts a maximum‡ air concentration of parathion at 1.4 μg/m^3, which is below the screening value of 5 μg/m^3. Therefore, parathion would not be expected to cause adverse health effects.

Additional information that parathion is not expected to cause adverse health effects is the Temporary Emergency Exposure Limit (TEEL Level 0§) of 100 μg/m^3 for parathion, which is a risk-based value for one hour exposures. The maximum predicted air concentration at ¼ mile downwind falls ten times below the TEEL-0 indicating that adverse health effects are not likely.

While pesticide health effect research is ongoing, ATSDR recommends that pesticide exposure (especially children) be reduced or eliminated. In particular, efforts should be directed at decreasing exposure to pesticides used in homes and gardens as well as lawns and recreational areas, which are the major sources of pesticide exposure for the majority of children (Zahm and Ward 1998). It is also prudent public health policy to encourage the use of agricultural practices that minimize off-site migration of pesticides.

2.5 Associations Between Datasets

For most of this consultation, ATSDR reviewed individual datasets. In this section, the associations between datasets are discussed for insight into exposures. The magnitude of the measured values are evaluated in previous sections and not discussed here. The individual datasets include:

- Blood and Urine Samples
- Indoor Dust Samples
- Outdoor Residential Yard Soil Samples

The relationships among these datasets are discussed in the following sections in relation to the Nevada Department of Agriculture database and the NCEH cross-sectional study questionnaire. Table 9 contains a summary of the pesticides discussed in this Section.

2.5.1 Blood and Urine Samples

Actual exposures to pesticides were identified in blood and urine samples collected from case and control families from August to October 2001. Pesticides found significantly above background levels included one organophosphate pesticide (chlorpyrifos), one organophosphate metabolite (diethylthiophosphate), two chlorinated phenol pesticides (2,4,5-trichlorophenol and 2,4,6-trichlorophenol), a fungicide (o-phenylphenol), and DDE. 2-Naphthol was found slightly higher than reference values.

The source of chloropyrifos is most likely from use in homes to control termites and other

‡ Based on different wind speeds and droplet sizes.

§ TEELs are developed by the Department of Energy, Subcommittee on Consequence Assessment and Protective Actions, to assist in emergency preparedness and response. Four TEEL levels are available. TEEL Level 0 values are threshold concentrations below which most persons will experience no appreciable risk of health effects.

insects. Of the 80 homes sampled for pesticides in indoor dust, 21 samples detected chloropyrifos. Only 3 of the homes had chlorpyrifos detected in yard soils. However, NCEH did not find a correlation between urine and blood pesticide levels and the use of pesticides in homes as indicated in the cross-sectional study questionnaire or between urine and blood pesticide levels and indoor and outdoor dust samples (A. Holmes, NCEH/CDC, personal communication, 2003). Exposure to chlorpyrifos in foods is also possible because it was the sixth most detected pesticide residue on foods based on total diet (FDA 2002). Chloropyrifos was not reported in the Nevada Department of Agricultural database.

The compound diethylthiophosphate is a metabolite of at least nine organophosphate pesticides including chlorpyrifos, diazinon, disulfoton (Di-Syston 8), and parathion (ethyl) (Table 10). The agricultural database indicates that disulfoton and parathion have been used to control insects on crops in Churchill County. These two pesticides are restricted-use pesticides indicating that use is limited to specially trained applicators, usually commercial pesticide companies. Parathion was not detected in any of the indoor dust or yard soil samples. Disulfoton was not sampled for. Diazinon was detected in indoor dust samples of 65 homes and in samples of 19 yard soils. Chlorpyrifos was detected in indoor dust samples of 21 homes. Chlorpyrifos was the sixth most frequently found pesticide residue on food (FDA 2002). The increased presence of this metabolite may be from several different sources including use of pesticides in the home, agricultural use, or from foods.

2,4,5-Trichlorophenol and 2,4,6-trichlorophenol are two metabolites of several organochlorine chemicals pesticides including beta- and gamma-hexachlorocyclohexanes. Gamma-hexachlorocyclohexane is also called lindane. Lindane was found in the yard soils of 4 homes, and beta-hexachlorocyclohexane was found in the yard soils of 3 homes. Neither compound was found in indoor dust samples. The hexachlorocyclohexanes were not reported in the agricultural database. Lindane was the eleventh most frequently found pesticide in a 2000 survey of foods representing a total diet (FDA 2002) and is dispensed in prescription shampoos to treat head lice and scabies. It is a persistent organochloride and has long-range atmospheric transport potential. Lindane is no longer manufactured in the United States, and EPA cancelled most agricultural and dairy uses in 1985 because of concerns about the compound's potential to cause cancer (Pesticide Information Project 1996c; U.S.EPA 2002a). If 2,4,5-trichlorophenol and 2,4,6-trichlorophenol are from lindane, the source of this exposure could either be from prescription use, from historical outdoor use, or from long-range transport from international use.

o-Phenylphenol was detected at levels significantly above background levels. o-Phenylphenol is used as a fungicide, germicide, household disinfectant, preservative in water-oil emulsions (including paints), and in a post-harvest treatment of fruits and vegetables to protect against microbial damage (HSDB - Hazardous Substances Data Bank 2002). o-Phenylphenol was not analyzed in indoor dust and yard soils samples and is not in the agricultural database. Exposure is most likely from food or household disinfectants.

DDE is a biologic metabolite and environmental breakdown product of DDT and DDD. DDT is a persistent organochlorine pesticide used to control mosquitoes and insects on agricultural crops. DDD was also used as a pesticide but to a more limited extent. DDD is also a breakdown product of DDT. Use of DDT was banned in the United States in 1972. DDE was found in blood samples and yard soils of 23 homes (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2002c). DDT and DDE have been found in 7 of 195 domestic samples of food (FDA 2002). Exposure to DDE is most likely at background levels perhaps through food or from yard soils.

2-Naphthol was found in urine at slightly higher levels than in reference values. 2-Naphthol has several different uses including dyes, pigments, fats, oils, insecticides, pharmaceuticals, perfumes, antiseptics, synthesis of fungicides, and antioxidants for rubber. 2-Naphthol in urine may also result from exposure to naphthalene in older types of mothballs, fires that produce polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and tobacco smoke. 2-Naphthol was not analyzed in indoor dust or yard soil samples and is not listed in the state agriculture database. Exposure could be from any of the intended uses, from tobacco smoke, or from other sources.

2.5.2 Indoor Dust Samples

Four pesticides were detected in indoor dust samples at more than 20 of 80 homes tested: chlorpyrifos (21 homes), diazinon (65), 1-naphthol (26), and N,N-diethyl-3-methylbenzamide (DEET) (66). Detection in dust samples was much less frequent than in outdoor soils.

Chlorpyrifos is commonly used in the home. Diazinon is classified as a restricted-use pesticide (RUP) and is for use by professional pest-control operators only. Diazinon is a nonsystemic organophosphate insecticide used to control cockroaches, silverfish, ants, and fleas in residential, non-food buildings. It is also used on home gardens and farms to control a wide variety of sucking and leaf-eating insects (Pesticide Information Project 1996b). Urine metabolites of diazinon include diethylphosphate and diethylthiophosphate. Diethylthiophosphate was detected at levels above reference values. Diazinon is listed in the state agriculture database (last reported use was 1983).

1-Naphthol is a urinary metabolite and environmental breakdown product of the carbamate pesticide carbaryl (the active ingredient in Sevin). Other sources of 1-napthol are similar to 2-naphthol discussed above. Carbaryl is listed in the state agriculture database with the latest use in 1984. Carbaryl is a wide-spectrum carbamate insecticide that controls more than 100 species of insects on citrus, fruit, cotton, forests, lawns, nuts, ornamentals, shade trees, and other crops, as well as on poultry, livestock, and pets (Pesticide Information Project 1996a). The carbaryl product Sevin may be purchased in hardware or garden stores. Sevin was detected in yard soils of 3 homes but not in any indoor dust samples. The presence of 1-naphthol in the indoor dust samples may be from many different sources as listed here.

N,N-Diethyl-3-methylbenzamide (DEET) was detected in indoor dust in 66 of 80 homes. DEET is the active ingredient in many insect-repellent products including those including that are applied directly to human skin. The presence of DEET in indoor dust is probably from its intended uses.

2.5.3 Outdoor Residential Yard Soil Samples

Five pesticides were detected in outdoor yard soils at 15 or more of 80 homes. These pesticides include cis-chlordane (21 homes), gamma-chlordane (24), DDE (23), diazinon (19), heptachlor epoxide (17), and N,N-diethyl-3-methylbenzamide (DEET) (66). These compounds were detected much less frequently than in indoor dust samples.

The chlordanes, DDE, and heptachlor epoxide were detected either infrequently or not at all in indoor dust. These compounds were all banned in the United States by 1988 but may still be used in other countries. Their presence is likely from historical use in Churchill County and use throughout the world.

Diazinon and DEET were found frequently in yard soils and indoor dust samples. Diethylthiophosphate, a urinary metabolite of diazinon was found elevated in case and control families. However, no correlations were found between urinary metabolites and pesticide levels found in indoor dust samples or yard soils (A. Holmes, NCEH/CDC, personal communication, 2003).

As discussed here, exposures to different pesticides come from several different sources including agricultural use; home, lawn, and garden use; background and long-range transport of persistent pesticides; and foods. The agricultural database only included commercially applied pesticides to agricultural fields and does not include owner applied pesticides for agricultural purposes or pesticides applied commercially or by owners to homes. Because some of the pesticides found in this data are typically used in the home or found in residues on food, exposure can occur from non-farm sources. The exact exposures cannot be determined with the existing data. To evaluate further, more exact historical information is needed on commercial and owner applications of pesticides in and outside the home, time-activity relationships of the families to determine their locations during pesticide applications, and pesticide residues on the foods consumed. Obtaining accurate data would be very difficult.

3.0 Conclusions

Pesticide use in Churchill County includes typical residential, commercial, and industrial applications but also includes agricultural use, mosquito control, noxious weed control, and control of weeds in and along roads and irrigation canals. Exposure to pesticides also occurs from FDA-allowable residues in the food supply.

The following conclusions are made from these data.

- Levels of pesticides and pesticide metabolites in blood and urine samples indicate that case and control families were exposed to several pesticides at levels greater than were U.S. based reference populations. However, case and control families had similar levels which indicate that there is not a correlation between current pesticide exposures and acute lymphocytic leukemia (ALL).
- Levels of pesticides and pesticide metabolites in blood and urine samples did not correlate with pesticides measured in indoor dust and residential yard soil samples

indicating that current pesticide exposures may be influenced by other sources than those sampled.

- Exposures to pesticides found in residential yard soils and indoor dust samples are not expected to cause adverse health effects based on available health screening values. These levels represent potential current exposures and not historical exposures.
- Acute effects of potential historical exposure of pesticides from the spray drift of aerial applications of pesticides shows that adverse health effects are not likely. However, ATSDR was not able to evaluate long-term health effects such as ALL sufficiently because limited or no data are available on the carcinogenicity of the pesticides.
- Historical evaluation of pesticide exposures in this study was limited to the interviews and the contents of the Nevada Department of Agriculture database. These information sources describe the commercial application of pesticides for agricultural purposes, government weed control, and mosquito control. Use of pesticides by individual farmers or property owners (home owner, land owner, or renter) for any purpose (agricultural, lawn, garden, termites, other insects) is not included. NCEH questionnaires provide information about individual pesticide use but may be subject to recall bias.

ATSDR concludes that **current exposures** are not likely to cause adverse health effects (ATSDR category of *no apparent public health hazard*) because pesticide exposures are occurring but below concentrations associated with adverse health effects.

ATSDR concludes that **past exposures** are an *indeterminate health hazard* because past exposures, especially during the time that childhood leukemia may have been initiated or promoted, is not precisely known. ATSDR tried to recreate historical exposures from agricultural aerial spraying, but other sources of exposure that cannot be accounted for in sampling or modeling are also possible.

4.0 Recommendations

ATSDR recommends that pesticide exposure (especially children) be reduced or eliminated. In particular, efforts should be directed at decreasing exposure to pesticides used in homes and gardens as well as lawns and recreational areas, which are the major sources of pesticide exposure for the majority of children (Zahm and Ward 1998). It is also prudent public health policy to encourage the use of agricultural practices that minimize off-site migration of pesticides. Sources of information about reducing exposure to pesticides are provided in Appendix B.

5.0 Preparers of this report

Brian Kaplan, M.S.
Environmental Health Scientist
Consultations Section
Exposure Investigation and Consultation Branch
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation

Gail Scogin
Environmental Health Scientist
Exposure Investigation Section
Exposure Investigations and Consultations Branch
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation

Ken Orloff, PhD
Toxicologist
Exposure Investigation Section
Exposure Investigations and Consultations Branch
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation

Michael L. Patterson, MD
Medical Officer
Exposure Investigation Section
Exposure Investigations and Consultations Branch
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation

Technical Assistance

David M. Esterly
Environmental Focus, Inc
Wilmington, Delaware

Steve Martin
Computer Information System Support Contractor/EDS, Inc.
Information Resources Management Branch
Office of Program Operations & Management

Leonard Young
Eastern Research Group
Lexington, Massachusetts

Ira Hubert and Kevin Liske
GIS Specialists
Spatial Analysis and Information Dissemination Section
Office of the Administrator

Jeanne Bucsela
Technical Writer-Editor
Office of Public and External Affairs
Office of the Administrator

Reviewers

John E. Abraham, PhD
Chief, Exposure Investigation and Consultation Branch
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation

Susan Moore, MS
Chief, Consultation Section
Exposure Investigation and Consultation Branch
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation

Susan Metcalf, MD
Chief, Exposure Section
Exposure Investigation and Consultation Branch
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation

Donald Joe
Chief, Petitions Section
Exposure Investigation and Consultation Branch
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation

Wendy Kaye, PhD
Chief, Epidemiology and Surveillance Branch
Division of Health Studies

6.0 References

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. 2001a. Interview with Charles Moses, Nevada Department of Agriculture by Brian Kaplan.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. 2001 Augb. Trip Report: Fallon, Churchill County, Nevada.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. 2002a. Record of communication between Debbie Sherman, Truckee-Carson Irrigation District and Brian Kaplan

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. 2002b. Record of communication between Lyman F. McConnell, Truckee-Carson Irrigation District and Brian Kaplan

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. 2002 Sepc. Toxicological Profile for DDT, DDE, and DDD.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. 2003a. Air Exposure Pathway Assessment, Fallon Leukemia Cluster Investigation
Fallon, Churchill County, Nevada.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. 2003 Febb. Health Consultation: Pathway Assessment for Churchill County Surface Soils and Residential Indoor Dust Churchill County, Nevada.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. 2003c. Record of communications with Charles Moses, Nevada Department of Agriculture and Brian Kaplan

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention NCfEH. 2001 Aug. Draft Public Health Action Plan for the Fallon Leukemia Cluster Investigation.

American Bird Conservancy. Ethyl Parathion. http://www.abcbirds.org/pesticides/Profiles/ethyl_parathion.htm . 2003. 1-8-2003.

Berkowitz GS, Obel J, Deych E, Lapinski R, Godbold J, Liu Z, Landrigan PJ, Wolff MS. 2003. Exposure to Indoor Pesticides during Pregnancy in a Multiethnic, Urban Cohort. Environmental Health Perspectives 111(1):79-84.

Bird SL, Esterly DM, Perry SG. 1996. Atmospheric Pollutants and Trace Gases: Off-Target Deposition of Pesticides from Agricultural Aerial Spray Applications. Journal of Environmental Quality 25:1095-104.

Bird SL, Perry SG, Ray SL, Teske ME. 2002. Evaluation of the AgDISP aerial spray algorithms in the AgDRIFT model. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 21(3):672-81.

Brody JG, Vorhees DJ, Melly SJ, Swedis SR, Drivas PJ, Rudel RA. Using GIS and historical records to reconstruct residential exposure to large-scale
pesticide application. Journal of exposure analysis and environmental epidemiology 12[1], 64-80. 2002.

Bureau of the Census. Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Matrices PL1 and PL2.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2003 Feb. Cross-Sectional Exposure Assessment of Environmental Contaminants in Churchill County, Nevada: Final Report.

Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District. 2001 Auga. Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District Operational Report.

Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District. 2001 Augb. Operational Report.

Churchill County Mosquito and Weed Abatement District. 2003. Comments on Draft Human Exposure Pathway Analysis of Pesticide Use in Churchill County

Colorado State University. Best Management Practices for Agricultural Pesticide Use. 1995.

Department of Health and Human Services CfDCaP. 2003 Jan. Second National Report on Human Exposure to Environmental Chemicals.

Esterly DM. 2002 Sep. Predicted Air Concentrations of Selected Pesticides Using AgDRIFT® 2.0.05 for Agricultural Applications and Supplemental Appendix C: Ground Deposition .

FDA. 2002. Food and Drug Administration Food and Drug Administration
Pesticide Program Pesticide Program, Residue Monitoring Residue Monitoring 2000.

Feychting M, Plato N, Nise G, Ahlbom A. 2001. Paternal occupational exposures and childhood cancer. Environ Health Perspect 109(2):193-6.

HSDB - Hazardous Substances Data Bank. o-phenylphenol. HSDB - Hazardous Substances Data Bank . 1-14-2002.

Ma X, Buffler PA, Gunier RB, Dahl G, Smith MT, Reinier K, Reynolds P. 2002. Critical windows of exposure to household pesticides and risk of childhood leukemia. Environ Health Perspect 110(9):955-60.

National Pesticide Information Center (NPIC). Definition of pesticide persistence. National Pesticide Information Center . 3-4-1999. 4-17-0003.

Nevada Cooperative Extension Service. 1991 Dec. Pesticide Use in Nevada Agriculture:

Grower's Response, 1990. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada; Report nr SP-91-07.

Nevada Department of Agriculture. 2001. Nevada's Coordinated Invasive Weed Strategy.

Nevada Department of Agriculture. 2002 Database of Registered Pesticides and Herbicides Used in Churchill County from 1970-2002.

Nevada Department of Human Resources. 2001. Letter from Dr. Mary Guinan to Dr. Henry Falk, ATSDR.

O'Rourke MK, Lebowitz M, Aguirre A. Final Report: Exposure of Children to Pesticide in Yuma County, Arizona. U.S.EPA, Office of Pesticide Programs. EPA Web site . 9-30-2003.

Overvold D. 2001. Letter to ATSDR regarding pesticide use by the Truckee Carson Irrigation District

Owens MJ, Gephart DR, Plantz LVGGL. 1996 Sep. Nevada Agricultural Statistics, 1995-1996. Nevada Agricultural Statistics Service;

Perera FP, Jedrychowski FP, Rauh FP, Whyatt RM. 1999. Molecular Epidemiologic Research on the Effects of Environmental Pollutants on the Fetus. Environmental Health Perspectives 107(Supplement 3):451-60.

Pesticide Information Project. Extoxnet: Extension Toxicology Network, Pesticide Information Profile, Carbaryl. http://pmep.cce.cornell.edu/profiles/extoxnet/carbaryl-dicrotophos/carbofuran-ext.html . 1996a.

Pesticide Information Project. Extoxnet: Extension Toxicology Network, Pesticide Information Profile, Diazinon. http://ace.orst.edu/cgi-bin/mfs/01/pips/diazinon.htm . 1996b.

Pesticide Information Project. Extoxnet: Extension Toxicology Network, Pesticide Information Profile, Lindane. http://pmep.cce.cornell.edu/profiles/extoxnet/metiram-propoxur/paraquat-ext.html . 1996c.

U.S.Department of Agriculture. 1999 Mar. 1997 Census of Agriculture.

U.S.Department of Agriculture NRCS. 2002. Soil Data Viewer 3.0.0s (Sept 2001)

U.S. EPA 1989. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume 1. Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A), EPA/540/1-89/002. December 1989

U.S.EPA. 1999 Mar. Exposure Data Requirements for Assessing Risks from Pesticide Exposure of Children.

U.S.EPA. Lindane Reregistration Eligibility Decision Facts, EPA-738-F-02-011. U.S.EPA . 2002a.

U.S.EPA OoPP. Pesticides Industry Sales and Usage: 1996 and 1997 Market Estimates. U.S.EPA . 12-31-2002b. 1-3-0003b.

U.S.EPA. 1997. Scientific Advisory Panel; Aerial Spray Drift Review; December 1997 Meeting.

Vogue PA, Kerle EA, Jenkins JJ. OSU Extension Pesticide Properties Database, National Pesticide Information Center. http://ace.orst.edu/info/npic/ppdmove.htm . 7-24-1994.

Willis GH, McDowell LL. 1987. Pesticide persistence on foliage. Reviews of environmental contamination and toxicology 100:23-73.

Zahm SH, Ward MH. 1998. Pesticides and childhood cancer. Environ Health Perspect 106 Suppl 3:893-908.

Figures

Figure 1. General Pesticide Exposure Model



Modified from (U.S.EPA 1999).

Figure 2. Crop Dusting and Mosquito Abatement Application Areas Near Fallon, Nevada



Figure 3. Land Use by Parcel, Fallon Vicinity



Figure 4. Land Use by Parcel, City of Fallon



Figure 5. An Example of Parcels with Commercial Applications of Pesticides for Agricultural Use (1994 through 2002).



Figure 6. Air Concentrations as a Function of Downwind Distance



Figure 7. Soil Deposition as a Function of Downwind Distance



Tables

Table 1. Nonpersistent Pesticide Levels* (µg/L)† in Urine of People Living in the United States and People Living in Churchill County, Nevada

Nonpersistent Pesticide or Metabolite	Metabolite of	Type	Agricultural/ Governmental Use Since 1970	United States: Geometric Mean (95% Confidence Interval)‡	United States: 95th Percentile	Churchill County: Geometric Mean (95% Confidence Interval)	Churchill County: % > U.S. 95th percentile	*Com-parison*
1-Naphthol	**Naphthalene Carbaryl**	**Repellent/Disinfectant Carbamate insecticide**	**No**	1.70 (1.38–2.09)	12.0 (7.20–19.0)	NC§	9.0	L¦
Methyl parathion	**--**	**Organophosphate**	**Yes**	NC	5.0 (3.30–9.0)	NC	10.0	—¶
Acephate		**Organophosphate**	**No**	NA#	NA	NC	NC	NC
Azinophos		**Organophosphate**	**Yes**	NA	NA	NC	NC	NC
Carbofuranphenol	**Carbofuran/ benfuracarb/ carbosulfan/ furathiocarb/ propoxur**	**Carbamate**	**Yes**	NC	0.74 (NC–1.30)	NC	0.0	—
Chlorpyrifos	**--**	**Organophosphate**	**Yes**	1.77 (1.56–2.01)	9.90 (7.60–14.0)	2.46 (1.93–3.14)	16.0	H**
Coumaphos		**Organophosphate**	**No**	NA	NA	NC	NC	NC
Diazinon		**Organophosphate**	**Yes**	NC	NC	NC	0.0	—
Diethyldithiophosphate	**See Table 2.**			NC	0.87 (0.65–1.0)	NC	9.0	—
Diethylphosphate	**See Table 2.**			1.03 (0.76–1.40)	13.0 (8.00–21.0)	NC	4.0	L
Diethylthiophosphate	**See Table 2.**			NC	2.20 (1.70–2.80)	1.04 (0.81–1.33)	30.0	H
Dimethyldithiophosphate	**See Table 2.**			NC	19.0 (17.0–37.0)	NC	4.0	—
Dimethylphosphate	**See Table 2.**			NC	13.0 (9.50–21.0)	NC	8.0	—
Dimethylthiophosphate	**See Table 2.**			1.82 (1.43–2.32)	46.0 (38.0–60.0)	NC	8.0	L
Isazophos	**--**	**Organophosphate**	**No**	NA	NA	NC	NC	NC
Malathion	**--**	**Organophosphate**	**Yes**	NC	NC	NC	0.0	—
Methamidophos	**Acephate**	**Organophosphate**	**No**	NA	NA	NC	NC	NC
Pirimiphos		**Organophosphate**	**No**	NA	NA	NC	NC	NC
Propoxur		**Carbamate**	**No**	NC	NC	NC	0.0	—
2,4-Dichlorophenol	**2,4-D**	**Phenoxy herbicide**	**Yes**	1.11 (0.88–1.40)	22.0 (17.0–31.0)	1.15 (0.91–1.46)	1.0	—
2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	***Urinary***	**Organochlorine**	**No**	NC	16.0 (4.30–39.0)	4.48 (3.64–5.53)	24.0	H

Nonpersistent Pesticide or Metabolite	Metabolite of	Type	Agricultural/ Governmental Use Since 1970	United States		Churchill County		Com-parison
				Geometric Mean (95% Confidence Interval)‡	95th Percentile	Geometric Mean (95% Confidence Interval)	% > U.S. 95th percentile	
	Hexachlorobenzene, hexachlorohexanes (HCH) including beta- HCH and gamma-HCH (lindane), and pentachlorophenol							
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	*Urinary* Hexachlorobenzene, hexachlorohexanes (HCH) including beta- HCH and gamma-HCH (lindane), and pentachlorophenol	Organochlorine	No	2.85 (2.58–3.15)	25.0 (17.0–37.0)	NC	17.0	H
Pentachlorophenol	*Urinary* Hexachlorobenzene, hexachlorohexanes (HCH) including beta- HCH and gamma-HCH (lindane), and pentachlorophenol	Organochlorine	No	NC	1.30 (0.66–2.0)	NC	4.0	—
2,4-D	--	Phenoxy herbicide	Yes	NC	NC	NC	9.0	—
2,4,5-T	--	Phenoxy herbicide	Yes, as Weedar and Weedone	NC	NC	NC	0.0	—
Atrazine		Triazine	Yes	NC	NC	NC	0.0	—
3-Phenoxybenzoic acid	Environmental breakdown product of pyrethroids			NA	NA	NC	0.0	NC
o-Phenylphenol		Fungicide/disinfectant	No	0.49 (0.41–0.59)	2.0 (1.60–2.50)	NC	18.0	H
DEET			No	NC	NC	NC	0.0	—

Nonpersistent Pesticide or Metabolite	Metabolite of	Type	Agricultural/ Governmental Use Since 1970	United States: Geometric Mean (95% Confidence Interval)‡	United States: 95th Percentile	Churchill County: Geometric Mean (95% Confidence Interval)	Churchill County: % > U.S. 95th percentile	*Com-parison*
2,5-Dichlorophenol	**p-Dichlorobenzene**	**Repellant/disinfectant**	**No**	6.01 (4.22–8.57)	440 (240–700)	NC	0.0	L
2-Naphthol	**Naphthalene**	**Repellant/disinfectant**	**No**	0.47 (0.33–0.68)	15.0 (9.90–19.3)	0.98 (0.73–1.32)	9.0	H

* Urine levels are noncreatinine adjusted. Blood levels are not lipid-adjusted.
† Micrograms per liter
‡ The interval of numbers in which we are 95% assured the value is contained.
§ Not Calculated was used when less than 60% of the study population had detectable levels of this chemical
¦? The upper boundary of the Churchill County CI was below the lower boundary of the CI for the U.S. level and b) less then 10% of the Churchill County participants had a value above the U.S. 95th percentile.
¶ The Churchill County geometric mean is consistent with national estimates.
\# Not available. This pesticide was not included in the *Second National Report on Human Exposure to Environmental Chemicals*, 2003.
** The lower boundary of the Churchill County confidence interval (CI) was higher than the upper boundary of the CI for the U.S. level or, b) more than 10% of the Churchill County participants had a value above the U.S. 95th percentile.

Table 2. Pesticide Levels in Indoor Dust Residential Surface Soil

SUBSTANCE	NUMBER OF DETECTIONS		MINIMUM CONCENTRATION (PPM)		MAXIMUM CONCENTRATION (PPM)		DETECTION LIMIT (PPM)		
	INDOOR DUST	YARD SOILS	INDOOR DUST	YARD SOILS	INDOOR DUST	YARD SOILS	INDOOR DUST	YARD SOILS	COMPARISON VALUE (PPM)
2,4-D†	12	0	10.3		29			0.5	20
Aldrin	0	0					0.002-0.07	0.0017–0.0027	0.04
Atrazine†	0	1		0.046		0.046	1		70
Carbofuran†	0	0					0.25	0.015	10
Chlorpyrifos	21	3	0.006	0.0057	0.53	0.825			2
Cis-chlordane	0	21		0.0026		0.13	0.002-0.21		1*
Coumaphos	0	0					2	0.3	NA‡
Cyfluthrin†	3	0	24		61			0.15	1000
Cypermethrin	1	0	240		240			0.15	500
Deltamethrin	1	1	0.96	0.179	0.96	0.179			NA
Diazinon	65	19	0.001	0.0003	1.3	0.807			55 (EPA R9)
Dieldrin	0	4		0.0026		0.19	0.005-0.1		0.04
Dimethoate†	0	0					0.5	0.002	0.4
Gamma-chlordane	0	24		0.0018		0.054	0.002-0.3		NA
Methyl-chlorpyrifos	0	0					1	0.003	610 (EPA R9)
DDD, P,P'	0	10		0.0022		0.0064	0.005-0.1		3
DDE, P,P'	0	23		0.0019		0.095	0.005-0.1		2
DDT, P,P'	0	10		0.0039		0.16	0.005-0.11		2
Alpha-Endosulfan	0	2		0.00068		0.0008	0.002-0.014		4§
Beta-Endosulfan	0	2		0.004		0.02	0.005-0.09		4§
Endosulfan Sulfate	0	2		0.0021		0.0024	0.005-0.1		4§
Endrin Aldehyde	0	3		0.0018		0.0022	0.005-0.27		NA
Endrin Ketone	0	1		0.0037		0.0037	0.005-0.1		NA
Endrin	0	0					0.005-0.1	0.0033-0.017	0.6
Guthion		0						2	
Heptachlor Epoxide	0	17		0.00099		0.017	0.002-0.09		0.08
Heptachlor	0	2		0.0017		0.0019	0.002-0.4		0.2
Hexachlorocyclohexane, alpha	0	2		0.0084		0.001	0.07		0.1
Hexachlorocyclohexane, beta	0	3		0.0029		0.0041	0.07		0.4
Hexachlorocyclohexane, delta	0	0					0.07		NA
Hexachlorocyclohexane, gamma	0	4		0.00098		0.014	0.07		0.5
Isazophos	0	0					0.05	0.001	NA
Isophorone		0						0.003	
Karbutilate†	0	0					50	0.33-0.53	NA
Lasso	0	0					0.25	50	0
Malathion†	6	1	0.2	0.229	14	0.229			40
Methyl parathion†	0	1		0.0087		0.0087	2		0.6
Methamidophos		0						0.01	
Methoxychlor	0	0					0.2-0.7	0.019	10
1-Naphthol	26	0	0.7		5.2			0.015	NA
N,N-Diethyl-3-Methylbenzamide	66	15	0.002	0.0005	1.78	0.045			NA
Orthene	0	0					6	0.6	80
Parathion†	0	0					0.2	0.005	370 (EPA R9)
Permethrin†	7	3	0.13	0.025	8.8	0.112			100
Pirimiphos	0	0					0.75	0.005	610 (EPA R9)
Methyl-pirimiphos	0	0					0.5	0.003	NA
Propoxur	2	0	0.285		1			0.01	8

SUBSTANCE	NUMBER OF DETECTIONS		MINIMUM CONCENTRATION (PPM)		MAXIMUM CONCENTRATION (PPM)		DETECTION LIMIT (PPM)		
	INDOOR DUST	YARD SOILS	INDOOR DUST	YARD SOILS	INDOOR DUST	YARD SOILS	INDOOR DUST	YARD SOILS	COMPARISON VALUE (PPM)
Sevin†	NAD	3	NA	0.058	NA	0.628			200
Toxaphene	0	1		0.28		0.28	0.2-7		0.6

† Agricultural pesticides applied in Churchill County according to the Nevada Department of Agriculture.
* Comparison Value for Chlordane
‡ Not Available
§ Comparison Value for Endosulf

Table 3. Summary of Commercially Applied Herbicides for Agricultural Purposes in Churchill County

Chemical	Active Ingredient	Soil Half-Life (days)	Application Timeframe (years)	Number of Acres Applied	Crops
Pursuit	Imazethapyr	90	1996-2000	2514	Alfalfa
Oust Herbicide	Methyl sulfometuron		1994-1996	1735	Non-crop
Velpar	Hexazinone	90	1999-2001	1000	Alfalfa
Krovar 1 DF	Bromacil/diuron		1992, 1994-1997	923*	Alfalfa and non-crop
Velpar L	Hexazinone		1999-2001	845	Alfalfa
Gramoxone® and Gramoxone® Extra	Paraquat	500	1996-2000	755	Alfalfa
2,4-D L.V. 6 Ester	2,4-D Ester	10	1994	660	Oats, corn, barley
Sencor and Sencor 4F	Metribuzin	30+	1998	260	Alfalfa
Atrazine †	2-Chloro-4-ethylamino-6-isopropylamino-s-triazine		2001	220	Corn
Lasso†	Alachlor		2000	108	Corn
Karbutilate†	m-(3,3-Dimethylureido)phenyl-tert-butyl carbamate		<1994	--	--

* 1994-1997 useage data

† Chemical or active ingredient included in the analysis of indoor dust or outdoor yard soils

Table 4. Summary of Commercially Applied Insecticides for Agricultural Purposes in Churchill County

Chemical	Active Ingredient	Soil Half-Life (days)	Application Timeframe (years)	Number of Acres Applied	Crops
Paraspray 8E	Ethyl parathion	14[*,†]	1994	3565	Alfalfa
Furadan 4F‡	Carbofuran	50[§,¶]	1994	830	Alfalfa
Dimethoate‡	Dimethoate		1994, 1996, 2000	959	Alfalfa and wheat
Methyl Parathion‡	Methyl Parathion		1996	320	Alfalfa
Sevimol	Carbaryl		1994-1995	259	Trees
Ambush‡	Permethrin		1994	200	Alfalfa
Di-Syston 8	Disulfoton		1994	187	Alfalfa

* (Vogue and others 1994)
† The EPA has cited tests that show the persistence in aerobic soil to be 50-140 days, and 6-88 days in anaerobic aquatic soils and sediments. The hydrolytic half-life of Paraspray 8E is 180 days (American Bird Conservancy 2003).
‡ Chemical or active ingredient included in the analysis of indoor dust or outdoor yard soils.
§ (Colorado State University 1995)
¶ Carbofuran has a half-life ranging from 1-8 weeks.

Table 5. Summary of Commercially Applied Mosquito Abatement Insecticides for in Churchill County

Active Ingredient	Chemical	Soil Half-Life (days)	Application Timeframe (years)	Number of Acres Applied
Malathion*	Fyfanon ULV	1 [43]	1991-1993, 1995-1997	100,000†
	Cythion ULV	1 [43]	1994-1995	14,500
	Malathion	1 [43]	1991 - 1993; 1996	1,700†
Pyrethrin	Pyrocide 5%		1995-1997	10,574
	Pyrenone 25-5		1994-1996	8,835
	Pyrocide 7396		1995	695
	Pyrocide 7067		1995	75
Naled	Dibrom	1 [44]	1994-1995	9,000
Methoprene	Altosid	<10 [44]	1994-1997	4,120
Cyfluthrin*	Tempo 20 WP		1994-1995	3,000
Resmethrin	Scourge		<1994	No data

* Chemical or active ingredient included in the analysis of indoor dust or outdoor yard soils.

† Number of acres only includes data after 1994. Prior to 1994, number of acres was not specified in the Department of Agriculture's database.

Table 6. Top 24 Most Used Agricultural Pesticides (based on acres applied) and their screening values.***

SUBSTANCE	NUMBER OF DETECTIONS		MINIMUM CONCENTRATION (PPM)		MAXIMUM CONCENTRATION (PPM)		DETECTION LIMIT (PPM)		COMPARISON VALUE (PPM)	SOURCE
	DUST	SOIL	DUST	SOIL	DUST	SOIL	DUST	SOIL		
2,4-D	12	0	10.3		29.0			0.5	20/500	ATSDR* /ATSDR**
Atrazine	0	1		0.046		0.046	1		70	ATSDR
Bromacil									5,700	FL†
Carbaryl									6,800	FL
Carbofuran	0	0					0.25	0.015	10	ATSDR*
Cyfluthrin	3	0	24		61			0.15	50	ATSDR
Dimethoate	0	0					0.5	0.002	0.4	ATSDR
Disulfoton									2.9	FL
Diuron									130	FL
Imazethapyr									15,000	EPA‡
Hexazinone									1,600	FL
Karbutilate	0	0					50	0.33-0.53	NA	--
Lasso	0	0					0.25	50	12	FL
Malathion	6	1	0.2	0.229	14	0.229			40	ATSDR EMEG§
Methyl Parathion	0	1		0.0087		0.0087	2		0.6	ATSDR
Metribuzin									32	FL
Methoprene									NA	--
Naled									130	FL
Methyl sulfometuron									9.100	EPA
Paraquat dichloride									160	EPA
Parathion (ethyl)	0	0					0.2	0.005	220	EPA
Permethrin/Pyrenone	7	3	0.13	0.025	8.8	0.112			100	ATSDR
Sevin	--	3	--	0.058	--	0.628			200	ATSDR

*** Data based on the Nevada Department of Agricultural database for commercially applied pesticides used for agricultural purposes. Substances with shading were not analyzed for in the indoor dust or yard soils but were in the database.

* ATSDR Chronic Oral Pica Child Reference Media Evaluation Guide (RMEG) calculated from EPA reference doses (RfDs), February 20, 2003.

** ATSDR Chronic Oral Child Reference Media Evaluation Guide (RMEG) calculated from EPA reference doses (RfDs), February 20, 2003.

† Florida Department of Environmental Protection Waste Management, Contaminant Cleanup Target Levels, Florida Administration Code, Chapter 62-777, added August 5, 1999.

‡ U.S. EPA Region 9, Preliminary Remediation Goal Concentrations, October 2002.

§ ATSDR Chronic Pica Child Environmental Media Evaluation Guide (EMEG) calculated from ATSDR Minimal Risk Levels (MRLs), February 20, 2003

Table 7. Summary of Pesticide Cancer Information.

		Carcinogencity		Cancer Classification*		
		Animal	Human	IARC	EPA	ACGIH
2,4-D L.V. 6 Ester	2,4-D Ester (chlorophenoxy compound)	Negative	Controversial non-hodgkins lymphoma, soft tissue sarcoma	2B	--	A4
Altoside	Methoprene	Negative in rats	--	--	--	--
Ambush‡	Permethrin		--	3	--	--
Atrazine †	2-Chloro-4-ethylamino-6-isopropylamino-s-triazine	Limited evidence (mammary tumors)	Inadequate	3	--	A4
Dibrom	Naled		--	--	--	A4
Dimethoate‡	Dimethoate	Limited (rats-liver and blood)	No data	--	--	--
Di-Syston 8	Disulfoton	No data	No data	--	--	A4
Furadan 4F‡	Carbofuran	Limited, negative	No data	--	--	A4
Fyfanon ULV/Cythion ULV/Malathion	Malathion*	No evidence	No data	3	--	A4
Gramoxone® and Gramoxone® Extra	Paraquat dichloride	Limited (rats: skin)	No data	--	C	--
Karbutilate†	m-(3,3-Dimethylureido)phenyl-tert-butyl carbamate		--	--	--	--
Krovar 1 DF	Bromacil	No evidence	No data	--	--	A3
Krovar 1 DF	Diuron	No evidence	No data	--	--	A4
Lasso†	Alachlor	Limited evidence (gastric and pulmonary)	No data	--	Probable Human (1984)	--
Methyl Parathion‡	Methyl Parathion	No evidence	No evidence	3	C	A4
Oust Herbicide	Methyl sulfometuron	--	--	--	--	--
Paraspray 8E	Ethyl parathion	Inadequate	No data	3	--	A4
Permethrin	Pyrocide/Pyronone/Pyrenone/Pyrethrin	Inadequate	No data	3	--	--
Pyrenone	Pyrocide/Pyronone/Pyrenone/Pyrethrin	No evidence	No data	--	--	--
Pursuit	Imazethapyr	No Information	No Information	--	--	--
Sencor and Sencor 4F	Metribuzin	Inadequate	No Data	--	D	A4

		Carcinogencity		Cancer Classification*		
		Animal	Human	IARC	EPA	ACGIH
Sevimol	Carbaryl	No data	No data	--	--	A4
Tempo	Cyfluthrin	Negative in mice and rats	No data	--	--	--
Velpar	Hexazinone	No evidence	--	--	--	--

Human Cancer Classifications are categories developed by different organizations to present weight-of-evidence information on the potential human health risk from specific compounds. The criteria used and the classifications differ between organizations.

IARC -International Agency for Research on Cancer/World Health Organization.

- Group 2 : This category includes agents, mixtures and exposure circumstances for which, at one extreme, the degree of evidence of carcinogenicity in humans is almost sufficient, as well as those for which, at the other extreme, there are no human data but for which there is evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental animals. Agents, mixtures and exposure circumstances are assigned to either group 2A (probably carcinogenic to humans) or group 2B (possibly carcinogenic to humans) on the basis of epidemiological and experimental evidence of carcinogenicity and other relevant data.
  - Group 2A: The agent (mixture) is probably carcinogenic to humans. This category is used when there is limited evidence of carcinogenicity in humans and sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental animals. In some cases, an agent (mixture) may be classified in this category when there is inadequate evidence of carcinogenicity in humans and sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental animals and strong evidence that the carcinogenesis is mediated by a mechanism that also operates in humans. Exceptionally, an agent, mixture or exposure circumstance may be classified in this category solely on the basis of limited evidence of carcinogenicity in humans.
  - Group 2B: The agent (mixture) is possibly carcinogenic to humans. This category is used for agents, mixtures and exposure circumstances for which there is limited evidence of carcinogenicity in humans and less than sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental animals. It may also be used when there is inadequate evidence of carcinogenicity in humans but there is sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental animals. In some instances, an agent, mixture or exposure circumstance for which there is inadequate evidence of carcinogenicity in humans but limited evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental animals together with supporting evidence from other relevant data may be placed in this group.
- Group 3: The agent (mixture or exposure circumstance) is not classifiable as to its carcinogenicity to humans. This category is used most commonly for agents, mixtures and exposure circumstances for which the evidence of carcinogenicity is inadequate in humans and inadequate or limited in experimental animals.

EPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency

Class A. Human carcinogen
Class B. Probable human carcinogen
B1. Chemicals with limited evidence of carcinogenicity from epidemiologic studies
B2. Chemicals with sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in animals, but inadequate evidence or no data from epidemiologic studies.
Class C. Possible human carcinogen
Class D. Not classifiable as to human carcinogenicity
E. Evidence of noncarcinogenicity in humans

ACGIH - American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists.

- A3 – Confirmed animal carcinogen with unknown relevance to humans: The agent is carcinogenic in experimental animals at relatively high dose, by route(s) of administration, at site(s), of histologic types(s), or by mechanism(s) that may not be relevant to worker exposure. Available epidemiologic studies do not confirm an increase risk of cancer in exposed humans. Available evidence does not suggest that the agent is likely to cause cancer in humans except under uncommon or unlikely routes or levels of exposure.
- A4 – Not classifiable as a human carcinogen: Agents which cause concern that they could be carcinogenic for humans but which cannot be assessed conclusively because of a lack of data. *In vitro* or animal studies do not provide indications of carcinogenicity which are sufficient to classify the agent into one of the other categories.

Table 8. Acute Air Screening Values.

Chemical	Primary Acute Air Screening Value	Alternative Acute Air Screening Value	
	PEL/TLV Derived Value (µg/m^3)	Value (µg/m^3)	Source
2,4-D L.V. 6 Ester	19.6		
Atrazine	19.6		
Ambush	97.8		
Bromacil	1000		
Carbaryl/Sevimol/Sevin	196		
Cyfluthrin/Tempo	48.9		
Dimethoate	No Value	34	CA Department of Pesticide Registration*
Disulfoton/Di-Syston 8	10		
Diuron	1000		
Imazethapyr/Pursuit	No Value	1000	Manufacturer suggested PEL/TLV†
Hexazinone/Velpar	64.5		
Karbutilate	No Value		
Lasso	19.6		
Furadan 4F	10		
Malathion/Fyfanon ULV/Cythion ULV	39.1		
Methyl Parathion	20		
Metribuzin/Sencor	48.9		
Methoprene	No Value		
Naled	10		
Methyl sulfometuron/Oust Herbicide	500		
Paraquat dichloride/Gramoxone® and Gramoxone® Extra	10		
Parathion (ethyl) /Paraspray 8E	5	100	Temporary Emergency Exposure Limit (TEEL-0)‡
Permethrin/Ambush	97.8		
Pyrocide/Pyronone/Pyrenone/Pyrethrin	500		

* California Department of Pesticide Registration, January 22, 2003. Ambient Air Monitoring for Pesticides in Lompoc, California.

† BASF Corporation, July 6, 2002. Material Safety Data Sheet—Lightning® Herbicide.

‡ The AIHA 2002 Emergency Response Planning Guidelines and Workplace Environmental Exposure Level Guides Handbook. AIHA Press, Fairfax, Virginia (2002) accessed from http://tis-nt.eh.doe.gov/web/chem_safety/teel.html [March 24, 2003]. TEEL-0 is the threshold concentration below which most people will experience no appreciable risk of health effects.

Table 9. Association of datasets; pesticides with high blood and urine levels and pesticides frequently detected in indoor dust and residential yard soil samples.

Pesticide/Metabolite	Blood	Urine	Indoor Dust: Number of Detections (80 Samples)	Indoor Dust: Exceed Screening Values	Yard Soils: Number of Detections (80 Samples)	Yard Soils: Exceed Screening Values	Ag Database	Rank in Top 16 Most Frequently Found Food Residues*	Other Information
Chlorpyrifos	NA†	H‡	21	No	3	No	No	6	Former home termiticide with wide range of uses in the home or for agricultural purposes for insect control
Diethylthiophosphate (metabolite)	NA	H							
Chlorpyrifos		H	21	No	3	No	No		
Diazinon		—§	65	No	19	No	1983		Used in home gardens and farms for insect control
Disulfoton			NAD**	NAD	NAD	NAD	1994		Restricted use pesticide
parathion (ethyl)			0	No	0	No	1994		Restricted use pesticide
2,4,5-trichlorophenol (metabolite) 2,4,6-trichlorophenol (metabolite)	NA	H H							
beta-hexachlorocyclohexane			0	No	3	NA	NA		Isomer and contaminant in lindane
gamma-hexachlorocyclohexane (lindane)			0	No	4	NA	NA	11	Present in medication shampoo, persistent organochloride pesticide subject to long range transport from international use
o-phenylphenol	NA	H	NAD	NA	NAD	NA	No		Fungicide, germicide, and household disinfectant
DDE (metabolite)	H		0	No	23	No	No		

* Pesticide residues found in a Total Diet Study in 2000 of 1035 items (FDA 2002)
† Not applicable.
‡ The lower boundary of the Churchill County confidence interval (CI) was higher than the upper boundary of the CI for the U.S. level or, b) more than 10% of the Churchill County participants had a value above the U.S. 95th percentile.
§ The Churchill County geometric mean is consistent with national estimates.
** Not analyzed.

Pesticide/Metabolite	Blood	Urine	Indoor Dust: Number of Detections (80 Samples)	Indoor Dust: Exceed Screening Values	Yard Soils: Number of Detections (80 Samples)	Yard Soils: Exceed Screening Values	Ag Database	Rank in Top 16 Most Frequently Found Food Residues*	Other Information
DDT	—		0	No	10	No	No	1	Banned in U.S. in 1972. Still used internationally
DDD			0	No	10	No	No		Banned in U.S. in 1972.
2-napthol (metabolite)	NA	H							Used in dyes, pigments, pharmaceuticals, perfumes, and antiseptics
Naphthalene			NAD	NA	NAD	NA	No		
1-napthol (metabolite)	NA	L††	26	NS‡‡	0	NS			
Carbaryl (Sevin)			NAD	NA	3	No	1984		Used in home gardens and farms for insect control
DEET	NA	NA	66	NS	15	NS	No		Personal mosquito control
Oxychlordane	—								
cis-chlordane			0	No	21	No	No		Banned in U.S. in 1988
gamma-chlordane			0	No	24	NS	No		Banned in U.S. in 1988
Heptachlor epoxide	—		0	No	17	No	No		Banned in U.S. in 1988

†† The upper boundary of the Churchill County CI was below the lower boundary of the CI for the U.S. level and b) less then 10% of the Churchill County participants had a value above the U.S. 95th percentile.

‡‡ No screening value available.

Table 10. Organophosphate Pesticide Metabolites[12]

Pesticide (CAS number)	Dimethyl-phosphate (813-79-5)	Dimethylthio-phosphate (1112-38-5)	Dimethyldithio-phosphate (756-80-9)	Diethyl-phosphate (598-02-7)	Diethylthio-phosphate (2465-65-8)	Diethyldithio-phosphate (298-06-6)
Azinphos methyl	•	•	•			
Chlorethoxyphos				•	•	
Chlorpyrifos				•	•	
Chlorpyrifos methyl	•	•				
Coumaphos				•	•	
Dichlorvos (DDVP)	•					
Diazinon				•	•	
Dicrotophos	•					
Dimethoate	•	•	•			
Disulfoton				•	•	•
Ethion				•	•	•
Fenitrothion	•	•				
Fenthion	•	•				
Isazaphos-methyl	•	•				
Malathion	•	•	•			
Methidathion	•	•	•			
Methyl parathion	•	•				
Naled	•					
Oxydemeton-methyl	•	•				
Parathion				•	•	
Phorate				•	•	•
Phosmet	•	•	•			
Pirimiphos-methyl	•	•				
Sulfotepp				•	•	
Temephos	•	•				
Terbufos				•	•	•
Tetrachlorviphos	•					
Trichlorfon	•					

12 Second National Report on Human Exposure to Environmental Chemicals, January 31, 2003.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DOWNWIND AIR CONCENTRATIONS AND DEPOSITION AMOUNTS OF PESTICIDES FROM AERIAL SPRAY DRIFT.

A REPORT BY
ENVIRONMENTAL FOCUS, INC.
SEPTEMBER 2002

STUDY TITLE:

Predicted Air Concentrations of Selected Pesticides Using AgDRIFT® 2.0.05 for Agricultural Applications

AUTHOR

David M. Esterly

REVISED DRAFT COMPLETED:

September 3, 2002

For:
Eastern Research Group
110 Hartwell Avenue
Lexington, MA 02421

By:

Environmental Focus, Inc.
2801 Bexley Ct.
Wilmington, DE 19808

Page

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures:

Appendices:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Nevada Department of Human Resources, Nevada State Health Division, identified an increase in the incidence rate of leukemia in children in the Fallon area. Fallon is a small city located within Churchill County, Nevada. In March 2001, the state of Nevada requested the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) to assist the local and state health and environmental agencies in evaluating possible environmental factors that could be associated with the higher than expected rate of leukemia. ATSDR discovered that residents were concerned about the potential health effects from pesticide and herbicide applications to control pests on crops and to control mosquitoes in the Fallon area.

As part of ATSDR's environmental evaluation, a spray drift model was used to estimate the potential exposure of area residents to agricultural pesticide applications. ATSDR identified several mathematical models that could be used to evaluate pesticide spray drift. The model selected for use in this study is AgDRIFT®, which was developed as part of a cooperative research agreement among the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Spray Drift Task Force. The AgDRIFT® model was used to estimate the potential exposure of area residents to agricultural pesticide applications. Two "worst case scenarios" were developed for applications to alfalfa, which is the most common crop in the Fallon area. The scenarios considered downwind air concentrations resulting from the aerial application of two common pesticides: 1) paraquat dichloride (Gramoxone® Extra) and 2) ethyl parathion (Parathion 8 EC).

The overall conclusions from the results of the agricultural spray drift model are provided below:

- The air concentration predicted by the AgDRIFT® model at a location 500 feet down wind from the spray field for the herbicide Gramoxone Extra was 22.6 nanograms per liter. This concentration was predicted with a wind speed of 5 miles per hour assuming a "fine" drop size distribution.

- The maximum down wind air concentration predicted by the AgDRIFT® model for the pesticide Parathion 8 EC was 4.5 nanograms per liter. This concentration was predicted at a distance of 500 feet downwind with a wind speed of 10 miles per hour and assuming a "fine" drop size distribution.

- The difference in predicted concentrations between Gramoxone Extra and Parathion 8 EC is a function of the concentration of the product being applied and the different application rates. Gramoxone Extra is a relatively dilute application and parathion 8 EC is considered a concentrated application. The different application rates combined with the different levels of product dilution affect the dispersion.

- The results of the spray drift model show that regardless of how dilute or concentrated the product used, the greatest potential for pesticide exposure will be within short distances (i.e., less than 500 feet) downwind of the target area or application zone. The further down wind from the application zone the more dilute the air concentration of the pesticide, even though the total mass (amount) of pesticide aloft remains relatively constant.

- The total amount of pesticide in the air down wind from the application zone is not heavily influenced by the wind speed. Wind speed does not have as large an impact on downwind concentrations as the drop size distribution or the product being applied (i.e., dilute or concentrated).

- According to the model results, there is approximately a four-fold reduction in the air concentrations when applying the pesticide product with a medium spray (i.e., drop size distribution class) compared with a fine spray.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A spray drift modeling study was conducted to predict the downwind air concentration of two pesticides applied aerially and used for the control of weeds and insects on alfalfa crops. The herbicide and insecticide products used in the model were represented by Gramoxone® Extra, which a relatively dilute application, and Parathion 8 EC, which is considered a concentrated application. The drift was predicted using the AgDRIFT® 2.0.05 model (Teske et. al. 2001) employing site-specific inputs. This set of regional conditions was then systematically modified to reflect the range of meteorological conditions one would expect in the Fallon, Nevada area during the normal application season.

The model evaluation considered aerial applications under the following spray conditions: “fine,” “fine to medium,” and “medium” spray drop size distribution classified according to the American Society for Agricultural Engineers (ASAE) S571 spray droplet size standard. The selected drop size distributions represent the majority of aerial applications from fixed winged aircraft.

2.0 BACKGROUND

In July 2000, the Nevada Department of Human Resources, Nevada State Health Division (NSHD), identified an increase in the incidence rate of leukemia in children for Churchill County, Nevada. A majority of the leukemia cases have been identified within the city of Fallon, located within Churchill County. Fallon is the largest population center in the county with approximately 7,540 residents. Approximately 23,980 people live in the surrounding unincorporated parts of Churchill County, which includes just less than 4,930 square miles of land (US Census Bureau 2000).

In response to this unexplained increase in leukemia, resources from local, state, and federal agencies were mobilized to provide scientific and technical expertise in hopes of better understanding the cause of the leukemia cluster. In March 2001, the state of Nevada requested the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) to assist the local and state health and environmental agencies in evaluating historical contaminant releases and potential exposure pathways that could potentially contribute to the increase in leukemia within Churchill County. As part of the agency's efforts to assist NSHD, ATSDR has attended meetings in Fallon, participated in public availability sessions, conducted site visits within Churchill County (e.g., Nevada Department of Agriculture and Churchill County Mosquito Abatement District), met with state agencies (e.g., NSHD and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection [NDEP]) and gathered information about potential environmental exposures, and recorded community environmental health concerns.

During these site visits and discussions with members of the community, ATSDR discovered that residents were concerned about the potential health effects from agricultural pesticide and herbicide spray drift as well as spraying to control mosquitoes and other pests in the Fallon area. As part of ATSDR's environmental evaluation, a review of the agricultural spray drift literature was conducted and models that have been used to evaluate spray drift were identified. The model selected for use in this study is AgDRIFT®, which was developed as part of the cooperative research agreement among the US Environmental Protections Agency (EPA), US Department of Agriculture, and the Spray Drift Task Force (SDTF).

The AgDRIFT® model was used to estimate the potential exposure of area residents to agricultural pesticide applications. AgDRIFT® is known for its ease of use, consistent reporting, comprehensive input descriptions, and extensive database support for meteorological conditions, aircraft setup, and atomization parameters. AgDRIFT® is the model used by most pesticide regulatory authorities, including the EPA, to estimate deposition and air concentration of pesticides during and shortly after application.

For purposes of this study, two "worst case scenarios" were developed for applications to alfalfa, which is the most common crop in the Fallon area and accounts for approximately 75 percent of the agricultural acreage (USDA 1997). The scenarios considered downwind air concentrations resulting from the aerial application of two common pesticides: 1) paraquat dichloride (Gramoxone® Extra) and 2) ethyl parathion (Parathion 8 EC)[1]

The "worst case" model approach is a common strategy that allows the selection of model inputs that maximize drift potential and allows extrapolation results to other application scenarios. For example, SDTF studies have shown that drift is independent of the amount and type of active ingredient, but is a function of initial concentration of non-volatile components of the spray tank mixture (SAP 1997). Thus the model prediction for a Gramoxone® tank mix of 0.74 lbs./acre, diluted with 5 gals./acre of water can be applied to any pesticide of similar spray tank composition by scaling the Gramoxone® results based on the ratio of non-volatile concentration in the tank mix.

The AgDRIFT® model has been verified by examining data from 180 aerial field study treatments performed by the SDTF and numerous studies conducted by the US Forest Service. EPA conducted a Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) review in December 1997 to evaluate the SDTF aerial data and the AgDRIFT model (Bird 2001;SAP 1997). All validations have shown the usefulness of AgDRIFT® for predicting pesticide deposition as a function of distance from the application zone.

1 Ethyl parathion is no longer registered for use in the United States.

3.0 OBJECTIVE

The objective of this study is to predict the off-target air concentration of pesticides used in Fallon, Nevada. The modeling was designed to be a conservative, but realistic representation of the potential exposure when applied to common agricultural crops. The model parameters are based on the maximum label use rate and site-specific application conditions. Model inputs not specified by the pesticide label are based on local agricultural practices and equipment.

4.0 MODELS AND METHODS

The AgDRIFT® Aerial model is a special case of the AGDISP (US Forestry Service Model) (Bilanin 1989). Both models assume a Lagrangian particle trajectory to track droplets in the turbulent flow fields near the application area. AgDRIFT® has been specially modified to evaluate downwind deposition and air concentrations. For this assessment of an aerial application, AgDRIFT® was used to calculate the downwind vertical pesticide mass profile or flux plane. The flux plane can be viewed as an imaginary vertical filter placed down wind of the application area. As the pesticide plume moves across the plane, the cumulative amount of product that passes through the flux plane is computed at each incremental distance above the ground. This mass flux is then converted to air concentration based on the vertical wind speed profile at the corresponding height above the ground. For the typical agricultural application scenario (release height of 7 to 10 feet) the AgDRIFT® model predicts a maximum mass flux at 2 to 3 meters above the ground and maximum air concentration at 2 meters above the ground (i.e., typical breathing level). Air concentrations at other elevations can be retrieved from the model output files. For purposes of this study, however, only the maximum air concentration is reported.

The AgDRIFT® model inputs are grouped into four categories: meteorological (section 4.1), equipment setup ((section 4.2), application parameters (section 4.3), and product physical properties (section 4.4). The modeling focused on the input parameters that have been shown to have the greatest effects on pesticide drift. These key inputs are selected based on the "worst case" scenario concept and are set to reflect upper limits of allowable or reasonable operating conditions. The remaining, lesser, parameters are based on regional best management practices, or model defaults. A summary of the model inputs is listed in Table 1. The model procedures are outlined in section 4.5.

4.1 Meteorological Inputs

The AgDRIFT® model includes three meteorological inputs considered to have the greatest influence on drift. Sensitivity studies have shown wind speed to be the most significant of these meteorological inputs. Most pesticide products limited the application conditions to less than10 miles per hour. However, applicators normally make applications in the early morning hours when wind speeds are at a minimum. Since wind speed is considered a critical input and can have a significant range of values, this study compared the expected air concentrations at wind speeds of 5 and 10 miles per hour.

The combined inputs of temperature and relative humidity control the rate of evaporation. For many application scenarios evaporation rate is not a dominant factor. However, in the desert surrounding Fallon, NV, the evaporation rate is a greater concern. Therefore, the selected model inputs for temperature and relative humidity represent the mean (i.e., average) values for the months of April and June in Fallon, NV (NCDC 2002). April and June were selected as representative months because most of the pesticides are applied to alfalfa crops in Churchill County in the spring (Personal communications with Jerry Frey, Pesticide Aerial Applicator, November 2001).

4.2 Equipment Setup

During the initial phase of this evaluation, ATSDR conducted an interview with the applicator that performs most of the agricultural spraying in the Fallon area. Based on the interview, it was determined that the Cessna Ag Truck 188 was the predominant aircraft used for agricultural applications. It was also determined that the aircraft was not highly modified and used the standard boom and nozzle arrangement supplied by the manufacturer. The Cessna aircraft is included in the AgDRIFT® Aerial Equipment Database developed by the U.S. Forest Service. This modeling study used the default aircraft configuration model and set the "spray boom" to 80 percent of the aircraft wingspan. The 80 percent boom length is considered to be maximum length for good pesticide coverage.

4.3 Application Parameters

The application parameters describe the conditions controlled by the applicator during the spray operation. These parameters include the spray release height, drop size distribution, aircraft speed, and spray swath. Of these model inputs, the release height and drop size distribution have a significant influence on the potential drift. The release height was set equal to the model default value of 10 feet above the crop, considered to be the maximum desirable release height for most applications.

Three different drop size distributions, as defined by ASAE standard S571, were evaluated in this study to simulate the range of drop sizes expected for aerial application for both insecticides and herbicides. The statistical descriptions of the three spray drop distributions are listed in Table 2. Atomization studies conducted by the Spray Drift Task Force, U. S. Forest Service, and other researchers show that most nozzles used in aerial application produce a Fine to Medium classification as defined by the ASAE standard. Many factors contribute to the drop size distribution including, the nozzle type, pump pressure, nozzle orientation, spray tank physical properties, etc. Since the applicator can adjust these parameters to achieve the desired drop size distributed, this study assumes the applicator sets the application parameters to produce a fine spray (insecticides) to a medium spray (herbicides). The AgDRIFT model was run using three different input values for drop size distribution; 1) fine, 2) fine-medium, and 3) medium (see Table 2 for specific parameters corresponding to each drop size). Coarse spray classifications can be achieved for aerial applications, but they would not be considered "worst case" scenario inputs for spray drift evaluations.

4.4 Product Physical Properties

The physical properties of the spray tank mixture can affect both the drop size distribution and the evaporation rate. The drop size distributions are addressed in Section 4.3 above (Application Parameters). Restricting the model drop size distribution (e.g., fine, fine-medium, and medium) to a standard size class such as the ASAE standard, allows the study to compare multiple products at similar conditions, but assumes the applicator is informed on spray methods and techniques such as nozzle selection and nozzle orientation to achieve the desired spray quality.

In most cases the evaporation is controlled by the water concentration of the tank mixture and limits the evaporation to the amount of water in the droplet. When all the water is evaporated from the droplet, the droplet size approaches the size of an aerosol spray. The movement of aerosol sprays is controlled more by their gaseous diffusion than by gravity and droplet deposition approaches zero, while the total mass of pesticide in the air remains constant.

This study attempts to investigate the maximum drift potential, which occurs when the drop sizes are at their smallest and have the highest concentration active product. The model simulates maximum evaporation rates by setting the tank mix water content to the lowest amount specified by the label. Low water content and the selection of low relative humidity and warm temperatures tend to accelerate evaporation to the point of dryness (the smallest droplets), which in turn increases the drift potential and the air concentration down wind of the application area.

4.5 Model Procedures

The model was run for each of the sample products, Parathion 8 EC and Gramoxone® Extra. The two models include the Cessna 188 Ag Truck, regional meteorological conditions, and spray material definitions for Parathion or Gramoxone. All major inputs are summarized in Table 1. The complete AgDRIFT® input summary for the two products is provided in Appendix A. The models were run to determine the following:

1. The air concentration of Parathion 8 EC and Gramoxone® Extra, as a function of downwind distance from a given application area. The air concentration for dilute sprays (Gramoxone®) and concentrated sprays (Parathion 8EC) were compared.

2. The effect of drop size distribution on air concentration using the three drop size distributions typically found in aerial applications.

3. The effect of wind speed on drift and air concentration. Increased wind speed increases the drift (fraction of the application aloft or not deposited) and increases the dilution of the application that is airborne. The combined effect is evaluated by comparing the air concentration (Tables 3a–3d) and the fraction aloft (Tables 5a–5d).

4. The effects of field size on drift and air concentrations. The fine and medium drop size distributions at wind speeds of 5 and 10 miles per hour were compared for each baseline model to evaluate the relationship between field size and potential air concentrations.

The AgDRIFT® model limits the maximum distance of the vertical flux plane to 2,500 feet. To investigate the air concentration beyond this distance, the air concentrations were extrapolated to 5,000 feet and 10,000 feet[2] The AgDRIFT® model does not limit the fraction aloft prediction to 2,500 feet. Several extrapolation method were tested and power function of the form

2 As with any extrapolating method, the results are untested and should be used with the appropriate precautions

$Y = a^* X^b$ provided the most consistent results (see Figure 1).

$$Y = a^* X^b$$

where: Y is the expected air concentration X feet down wind.
X is the distance down wind from the field edge in feet.
a and b are constants developed for each case.

The constants "a" and "b" are the individual curve fit parameters and were calculated using the "Microsoft® Excel 2000" Trend Line option. Appendix B contains a table of the power functions for each model case.

5.0 RESULTS

The results are summarized in Tables 3a to 3d, Table 4, and Tables 5a to 5d. The maximum air concentration was estimated for each wind speed and each product for the three drop size distributions (fine, fine-medium, and medium). The results of the spray drift model show that regardless of how dilute or concentrated the product used, the greatest potential for pesticide exposure will be within short distances (i.e., less than 500 feet) downwind of the target area. The consistency of the model results support the EPA's SAP conclusions regarding the applicability of AgDRIFT® for predicting pesticide deposition as a function of distance from the application zone.

Tables 3a–3d present the maximum one-hour time-weighted concentrations at the point in the spray plume where maximum concentrations are expected to occur. As shown in Tables 3a–3d, there is about a four-fold reduction in the air concentration for a medium spray versus a fine spray. This result is consistent with the Spray Drift Task Force field data and the findings of other researchers (Matthews 1992). The air concentration was also compared for two common field sizes of ¼ section and a full section of 640 acres (Table 4)[3]

The model demonstrates that at down wind distances of ¼ mile or more, most of the pesticide has deposited on the ground. The integration of the Pesticide Flux Profile (the amount of pesticide passing through a plane at a selected distance from the application zone) yields the total mass of pesticide aloft at that distance. This value divided by the total pesticide applied is defined as the fraction aloft or not deposited. Tables 5a to 5d presents the fraction aloft predicted for each of the model scenarios, expressed as the total mass to spray plume as the plume moves down wind (also see Figures 2a to 2d for graphical representation). Except for the ASAE fine

---

3 The spray tank capacity of the Cessna 188 is about 280 gallons sufficient volume to spray 140 acres at 2 gallon per acre. To spray a full section would require four or more tank loads of material. Although the field size does not change the mass of the pesticide lost to the local environment, it does affect the resulting air concentration due to the time period between each application load. This field size comparison is for reference only since it does not correct for the time require to refill the aircraft.

spray cases, the fraction aloft is less than one percent of the total amount applied within 0.5 mile (2,500 ft) of the application zone. The fraction aloft decreases to less than 0.5 percent of the total mass applied within 1 mile (5,000 ft) of the application zone.

6.0 DISCUSSION (Model Validity and Issues of Uncertainty)

6.1 Model Validation

The AgDRIFT® 2.0 model was evaluated by Bird et. al. using 180 field studies conducted by the SDTF. Bird et. al. reports that the AgDRIFT® model consistently over predicted the measured deposition. For example, when evaluating the far-field (i.e., beyond 600 feet from the edge of the field) distances AgDRIFT® over predicted the measured deposition by a factor of two, 80 percent of the time. Several explanations have been proposed as to why AgDRIFT® consistently over predicts in the far field (e.g., incomplete recovery of application product or differences in evaporation rates at or near the spray nozzle). However, from a public health perspective the tendency for the model to consistently over predict deposition may be considered an additional margin of safety (Bird et. al. 2001).

6.2 Predicted Air Concentrations

Based on the "worst case" scenario approach, the results presented in this report should represent a conservative estimate of air concentrations adjacent to and down wind from the spray block. AgDRIFT® calculates the air concentration by "time integration" of the total pesticide passing through the flux plane and divides the mass by the total air volume that would pass through the same point in space over a period of one hour. The air concentration is a function of both height and wind speed. The air concentrations reported in this study are the peak or maximum concentrations, which occur at a height of 3 to 6 feet above the ground.

As the droplets travel down wind they will evaporate. AgDRIFT® tracts the droplet size, concentration, and its position in space as it moves down wind. However, AgDRIFT® does not assume the droplets will collide or be removed by any surface other than the ground. In the real environment both man-made and natural structures likely remove a portion of the spray plume. Not accounting for this factor results in an over prediction of ground level pesticide concentrations down wind.

It should also be noted that although the AgDRIFT® model is likely to provide conservative estimates of downwind pesticide air concentrations; there are certain application exposures that the model may not account for. For example, the model does not account for active product that evaporates after being deposited on the intended target (i.e., alfalfa). The model also assumes that standard safe application practices are being followed by the applicator. If such practices are not followed, a greater portion of the product may be distributed away from its intended target and the model would consequently under predict exposures.

The model findings also indicate that down wind air concentration are not as dependent on wind speed as might be expected. Although this may appear to conflict with the concept that drift increases with wind speed, it shows the basic difference between drift and deposition. At large distances down wind the larger drops have time to deposit on the ground, leaving only the smaller droplets to reach the down wind vertical flux plane[4]. Although increased wind speeds keep a greater fraction of the spray particles aloft, thus increasing concentration, the higher wind speeds also transport greater volumes of air through the spray cloud, which acts to decrease concentration.

4 The number of droplets that reach the flux plane is proportional to the number of small drops (<100µ) in the initial drop size distribution and number of small droplets formed by evaporation. Although increasing wind speed increases the dispersion, the total pesticide in the air is a function of the number of small droplets and the concentration is thus more a function of dispersion time and distance down wind. As the distance increases the deposition approaches zero and the total mass of the product applied in the air is composed of small aerosol size droplets, which tend not to deposit but continue to be suspended and dispersed in the air. Thus the fraction aloft or total mass aloft remains constant, while the air concentration decreases due to dispersion of the pesticide as what remains in the air is transported down wind.

The deposition near the application area is often proportional to the application area. Table 4 shows that by increasing the application area by a factor of 4 the down wind air concentration increases by less than two-fold. This result reflects the increase in dispersion as one moves farther down wind from the application.

7.0 REFERENCES

Bilanin, A.J., Teske, M.E., Barry, J.W. and Ekblad, R.B., AGDISP: Aircraft Spray Dispersion Model, Code Development and Experimental Validation, TRANS Am. Soc. Agric. Eng. Vol. 32, pp. 327-334, 1989.

Bird, S.L. Cooperative Research and Development Agreement: The Spray Drift Task Force; The National Exposure Research Laboratory, United States Environmental Protection Agency; The Agricultural Research Service U. S. Department of agricultural; and Forest Pest Management U.S. Forest Service U. S. Department of agricultural, EPA File #0083-B-93, Draft. 2001.

Bird, S.L., S.G. Perry, S. Ray and M.E. Teske. 2001. "An Evaluation of Agdrift 1.0 for Use in Aerial Applications." Accepted for publication in Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry. 2001.

Matthews, G.A. "Pesticide Application Methods" 2nd edition, Longman Scientific & Technical, 1992

National Climatic Data Center. 2002. Climate statistics collected at the Fallon Experiment Station between 1997 and 2001.

Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP). 1997. Meeting: Aerial Spray Drift Review. December 1997. www.epa.gov/scipoly/sap/1997/december/spraydrift.htm

Teske, M.E., Bird, S.L., Esterly, D.M., Ray, S.L. and Perry, S.G. 2001. A User's Guide for AgDRIFT® 2.03, Technical Note No. 95-10, CDI, Princeton, NJ, U.S.A. 2001.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1997. 1997 U.S. Census of Agriculture: Crop Statistics.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Matrices PL1 and PL2. 2000.

Table 1: Recommended input values and rationale for developing two exposure scenarios for agricultural spray drift

Description of: AgDRIFT Model Inputs	Recommended Input Values for two spray drift exposure scenarios		Rationale for Selecting Values
	Scenario 1 (Gramoxone Extra)	Scenario 2 (Parathion 8 EC)	
Equipment Setup			According to the primary spray applicator in the Fallon area, Jerry Frey, most of the agricultural spraying in the Fallon area is conducted with the Cessna AgTruck 188.
Aircraft Type	Cessna 188 Series	Cessna 188 Series	
Weight of Aircraft	2,768 lbs (average)	2,768 lbs (average)	
Wing Semi-span	20.8 feet	20.8 feet	
Flight Speed	115 mph	115 mph	
Swath Width	60 feet (COV 35%)	60 feet (COV 35%)	The Swath width is determined by the aircraft type Boom length and wind speed.
Swath displacement	22 feet (50% application rate)	22 feet (50% application rate	The swath displace in determined by wind speed.

Table 1: Recommended input values and rationale for developing two exposure scenarios for agricultural spray drift Continued

Application Parameters			
Number of Nozzles	34 (typical boom design)	34 (typical boom design)	
Nozzles type	3 sub cases see note	3 sub cases see note	The angle of the nozzle (e.g., horizontal and vertical offset) in relation to the direction and speed of travel affects droplet size. The droplet size is an important component of spray drift potential. Three drop size distributions based of the ASAE standard 571 will be model to evaluate the rage of expected drop sizes for aerial applications. The three ranges: fine VMD = 180μ, fine to medium VMD = 255μ, and medium VMD = 294μ are based on solid stream and CP nozzles used in the majority of aerial applications. The fine spray, represent the worst-case scenario and would not be typical of herbicide applications.
Vertical Offset	Aircraft default	Aircraft default	
Horizontal Offset	Aircraft default	Aircraft default	
Boom Span	80% of semi-span (common)	80% of semi-span (common)	
Spacing (even)	1 foot (typical boom design)	1 foot (typical boom design)	
Release Height	10 feet	10 feet	The release height of Gramoxone Extra is recommended not to exceed 10 feet. According to the primary applicator of pesticides in the Fallon area, most releases are lower than 10 Feet (generally ranges from 3 - 10 feet).

Table 1: Recommended input values and rationale for developing two exposure scenarios for agricultural spray drift continued

Meteorological Inputs			
Wind Speed (At 2 meters)	5 and 10.0 mph	5 and 10.0 mph	NOAA SAMSON Database Tonopah, NV
Wind Direction	Perpendicular to the spray path	Perpendicular to the spray path	Default Case
Surface Roughness (ft)	0.3	0.3	Surface Roughness 1–1.5 ft high grass
Stability	Stable conditions	Stable conditions	AgDRIFT limit
Relative Humidity	25 percent	25 percent	NOAA SAMSON Database Tonopah, NV
Temperature	60 degrees	60 degrees	NOAA SAMSON Database Tonopah, NV
			All meteorology conditions represent the 75th percentile April through June day light hours conditions.
Product Physical Properties			
Specific Gravity	0.9 to 1.0	0.9 to 1.0	The values entered for the nominal application rate are based on information reported in the Nevada Department of Agriculture's pesticide application registry database. The rates for each product listed are the maximum application rates that were identified for each product.
Nominal Application Rate	0.74 lbs/ac (label maximum)	0.4 lbs/ac (label maximum)	
Swath Width	60 feet	60 feet	
Nonvolatile Fraction	5.32 % (label mixing inst.)	31.2 % (label mixing inst.)	
Number of Flight Lines	20 model default (typical field size)	20 model default (typical field size)	To test case were investigate the effects on air concentration versus field size.

Table 2: Characteristics Associated With Drop Size Distributions

Parameter	ASAE standard S571 Classification		
	Fine	Fine to Medium	Medium
DV_{10} (μ)	76.2	113.8	131.2
DV_{50} (μ)	179.6	254.7	294.1
DV_{90} (μ)	366.5	443.7	517.9
Relative Span	1.6	1.3	1.3
Percent < 141 (μ)	34.0	15.9	11.7

Key:
[1] DV10 (μ) -The drop diameter (in microns) at which 10 percent of the spray volume is in drops smaller than this value, and 90 percent is in drops larger than this value.

[2] DV50 (μ) -The drop diameter (in microns) that divides the spray volume into two equal parts. For example, a DV50 of 150 microns means that 50 percent of the spray volume is in drops smaller than 150 microns, and the remaining 50 percent is in drops larger than 150 microns.

[3] DV90 (μ) - The drop diameter (in microns) at which 90 percent of the spray volume is in drops smaller than this value, and 10 percent is in drops larger than this value.

[4] Relative Span - A parameter representing the breadth of the drop size distribution, $(DV_{90}\text{-}DV0_{10})/DV0_{50}$.

[5] Percent < 141- Percentage of volume in drop sizes less than or equal to 141 microns. Droplets greater than 141 microns are generally considered to have little or no drift potential.

Table 3a: Down wind Air Concentration Gramoxone Extra 5 m/h wind speed

Gramoxone Extra --- 5 miles per hour wind speed			
Max Air Concentration ?g/l			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	22.583	8.308	5.736
1,500	7.840	2.732	1.781
2,500	4.491	1.589	0.990
5,000*	2.297	0.788	0.470
10,000*	1.151	0.387	0.221

* Downwind distances of 5,000 and 10,000 feet are extrapolated values.

Table 3b: Down wind Air Concentration Gramoxone Extra 10 m/h wind speed

Gramoxone Extra --- 10 miles per hour wind speed			
Max Air Concentration ?g/l			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	19.762	7.453	5.222
1,500	8.831	3.057	2.081
2,500	4.601	1.583	1.174
5,000*	2.718	0.888	0.569
10,000*	1.479	0.463	0.288

* Downwind distances of 5,000 and 10,000 feet are extrapolated values.

Table 3c: Down wind Air Concentration Parathion 8 EC 5 m/h wind speed

Parathion 8 EC --- 5 miles per hour wind speed			
Max Air Concentration ?g/l			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	3.592	1.299	0.815
1,500	1.112	0.445	0.243
2,500	0.614	0.253	0.132
5,000*	0.292	0.128	0.161
10,000*	0.137	0.064	0.080

* Downwind distances of 5,000 and 10,000 feet are extrapolated values.

Table 3d: Down wind Air Concentration Parathion 8 EC
10 m/h wind speed

Parathion 8 EC --- 10 miles per hour wind speed			
Max Air Concentration ?g/l			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	4.487	1.631	1.091
1,500	1.140	0.422	0.245
2,500	0.669	0.265	0.147
5,000*	0.284	0.114	0.058
10,000*	0.124	0.052	0.024

* Downwind distances of 5,000 and 10,000 feet are extrapolated values.

Table 4: Down wind Air Concentration comparison of field size

		Gramoxone Extra	Parathion 8 EC
Drop Size Distribution	Field Size	2500 ft down wind 5 m/h Concentration in ng/l	
Fine	1/4 section 160 acres	4.49	0.61
	1 section 640 acres	7.74	1.04
Medium	1/4 section 160 acres	0.99	0.13
	1 section 640 acres	1.68	0.22

Table 5a: Fraction Aloft Gramoxone Extra
5 m/h wind speed

Gramoxone Extra --- 5 miles per hour wind speed			
Fraction Aloft			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	0.030	0.011	0.008
1,500	0.012	0.004	0.003
2,500	0.006	0.002	0.001
5,000	0.002	<0.001	<0.001

Table 5b: Fraction Aloft Gramoxone Extra
10 m/h wind speed

Gramoxone Extra --- 10 miles per hour wind speed			
Fraction Aloft			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	0.063	0.024	0.016
1,500	0.038	0.014	0.009
2,500	0.027	0.009	0.006
5,000	0.016	0.005	0.003

Table 5c: Fraction Aloft Parathion 8 EC
5 m/h wind speed

Parathion 8 EC --- 5 miles per hour wind speed			
Fraction Aloft			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	0.010	0.003	0.002
1,500	0.004	0.002	<0.001
2,500	0.002	<0.001	<0.001
5,000	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Table 5d: Fraction Aloft Parathion 8 EC
10 m/h wind speed

Parathion 8 EC --- 10 miles per hour wind speed			
Fraction Aloft			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	0.025	0.009	0.006
1,500	0.010	0.004	0.003
2,500	0.007	0.003	0.002
5,000	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Figure 1 Example—Air Concentration Extrapolation method



Note: The extrapolation equations for other model scenarios used in this report are presented in Appendix B

Figure 2a Fraction Aloft for Gramoxone Extra at a Wind Speed of 5.0 m/h



Figure 2b Fraction Aloft for Gramoxone Extra at a Wind Speed of 10.0 m/h



Figure 2c Fraction Aloft for Parathion 8 EC at a Wind Speed of 5.0 m/h



Figure 2d Fraction Aloft for Parathion 8 EC at a Wind Speed of 10.0 m/h



Appendix A

Input Summaries for AgDRIFT® Model Runs

AgDRIFT® Input Data Summary

--General--
Tier: III
Title: scenario one Fallow NV Gramoxone Extra
Notes:

Calculations Done: Yes
Run ID: AgDRIFT® sc_1 fallon fine 5.agd 2.0.05 07-10-2002 10:26:45

Default values appear when they differ from the Current values.

--Aircraft--	----------Current-----------	----------Default-----------
Name	Cessna AgTruck 188	Air Tractor AT-401
Type	Library	Basic
Boom Height (ft)	10	
Flight Lines	20	
Wing Type	Fixed-Wing	
Semispan (ft)	20.8	24.5
Typical Speed (mph)	114.99	119.99
Biplane Separation (ft)	0	
Weight (lbs)	2768	6000
Planform Area (ft²)	206	294
Propeller RPM	2850	2000
Propeller Radius (ft)	3.6	4.5
Engine Vert Distance (ft)	-1.2	-1.2
Engine Fwd Distance (ft)	11.9	11.9

-Drop Size Distribution 1-		----------Current-----------		----------Default-----------	
Name			ASAE Fine		ASAE Fine to Medium
Type			Basic		
Drop Categories	#	Diam (um)	Frac	Diam (um)	Frac
	1	10.77	0.0013	10.77	0.0010
	2	16.73	0.0008	16.73	0.0003
	3	19.39	0.0012	19.39	0.0007
	4	22.49	0.0015	22.49	0.0003
	5	26.05	0.0025	26.05	0.0007
	6	30.21	0.0035	30.21	0.0010
	7	35.01	0.0040	35.01	0.0010
	8	40.57	0.0048	40.57	0.0020
	9	47.03	0.0082	47.03	0.0033
	10	54.50	0.0140	54.50	0.0053
	11	63.16	0.0210	63.16	0.0067
	12	73.23	0.0288	73.23	0.0090
	13	84.85	0.0362	84.85	0.0133
	14	98.12	0.0470	98.12	0.0223
	15	113.71	0.0597	113.71	0.0330
	16	131.73	0.0707	131.73	0.0393
	17	152.79	0.0863	152.79	0.0480
	18	177.84	0.1033	177.84	0.0647
	19	205.84	0.0953	205.84	0.0830
	20	238.45	0.0860	238.45	0.1147
	21	276.48	0.0867	276.48	0.1283
	22	320.60	0.0827	320.60	0.1380
	23	372.18	0.0623	372.18	0.1127
	24	430.74	0.0347	430.74	0.0640
	25	498.91	0.0238	498.91	0.0440
	26	578.54	0.0168	578.54	0.0317
	27	670.72	0.0112	670.72	0.0203
	28	777.39	0.0047	777.39	0.0093
	29	900.61	0.0005	900.61	0.0010
	30	1044.42	0.0003	1044.42	0.0007
	31	1210.66	0.0002	1210.66	0.0003

--Nozzle Distribution--		----------Current----------				----------Default----------			
Boom Length (%)					76.3				
Nozzle DSD & Locations	#	DSD	H(ft)	V(ft)	F(ft)	DSD	H(ft)	V(ft)	F(ft)
	1	1	-16.5	0	0	1	-18.7	0	0
	2	1	-15.5	0	0	1	-17.79	0	0
	3	1	-14.5	0	0	1	-16.87	0	0
	4	1	-13.5	0	0	1	-15.96	0	0
	5	1	-12.5	0	0	1	-15.05	0	0
	6	1	-11.5	0	0	1	-14.14	0	0
	7	1	-10.5	0	0	1	-13.22	0	0
	8	1	-9.5	0	0	1	-12.31	0	0
	9	1	-8.5	0	0	1	-11.4	0	0
	10	1	-7.5	0	0	1	-10.49	0	0
	11	1	-6.5	0	0	1	-9.58	0	0
	12	1	-5.5	0	0	1	-8.66	0	0
	13	1	-4.5	0	0	1	-7.75	0	0
	14	1	-3.5	0	0	1	-6.84	0	0
	15	1	-2.5	0	0	1	-5.93	0	0
	16	1	-1.5	0	0	1	-5.02	0	0
	17	1	-0.5	0	0	1	-4.1	0	0
	18	1	0.5	0	0	1	-3.19	0	0
	19	1	1.5	0	0	1	-2.28	0	0
	20	1	2.5	0	0	1	-1.37	0	0
	21	1	3.5	0	0	1	-0.456	0	0
	22	1	4.5	0	0	1	0.456	0	0
	23	1	5.5	0	0	1	1.37	0	0
	24	1	6.5	0	0	1	2.28	0	0
	25	1	7.5	0	0	1	3.19	0	0
	26	1	8.5	0	0	1	4.1	0	0
	27	1	9.5	0	0	1	5.02	0	0
	28	1	10.5	0	0	1	5.93	0	0
	29	1	11.5	0	0	1	6.84	0	0
	30	1	12.5	0	0	1	7.75	0	0
	31	1	13.5	0	0	1	8.66	0	0
	32	1	14.5	0	0	1	9.58	0	0
	33	1	15.5	0	0	1	10.49	0	0
	34	1	16.5	0	0	1	11.4	0	0

--Swath--	----------Current----------	----------Default----------
Swath Width	60 ft	
Swath Displacement	0.3702 x Swath Width	
Half Boom	No	

--Spray Material--	----------Current----------	----------Default----------
Name	Gramoxone Extra	Water
Type	User-defined	Basic
Nonvolatile Rate (lb/ac)	2	0.501
Active Rate (lb/ac)	0.74	0.2505
Spray Volume		
Rate (gal/ac)	5	2
Specific Gravity	1	
Evaporation		
Rate (μm²/deg C/sec)	84.76	

--Meteorology--	----------Current----------	----------Default----------
Wind Speed (mph)	5	10
Wind Direction (deg)	-90	
Temperature (deg F)	60	86
Relative Humidity (%)	25	50

--Transport--	----------Current----------	----------Default----------
Flux Plane (ft)	2500	0

--Terrain--	----------Current-----------	----------Default-----------
Surface Roughness (ft)	0.3	0.0246

--Advanced--	----------Current-----------	----------Default-----------
Wind Speed Height (ft)	6.56	6.56
Max Compute Time (sec)	600	
Max Downwind Dist (ft)	5200	2608.24
Vortex Decay Rate (mph)	1.25	1.25
Aircraft Drag Coeff	0.1	
Propeller Efficiency	0.8	
Ambient Pressure (in hg)	29.91	29.91

AgDRIFT® Input Data Summary

--General--
Tier: III
Title: Fallow NV base case Parathion 8 EC
Notes:

Calculations Done: Yes
Run ID: AgDRIFT® sc_2 fallon 5.agd 2.0.05 07-29-2002 12:37:21

Default values appear when they differ from the Current values.

--Aircraft--	----------Current----------	----------Default----------
Name	Cessna AgTruck 188	Air Tractor AT-401
Type	Library	Basic
Boom Height (ft)	10	
Flight Lines	20	
Wing Type	Fixed-Wing	
Semispan (ft)	20.8	24.5
Typical Speed (mph)	114.99	119.99
Biplane Separation (ft)	0	
Weight (lbs)	2768	6000
Planform Area (ft^2)	206	294
Propeller RPM	2850	2000
Propeller Radius (ft)	3.6	4.5
Engine Vert Distance (ft)	-1.2	-1.2
Engine Fwd Distance (ft)	11.9	11.9

-Drop Size Distribution 1-		----------Current----------		----------Default----------	
Name			ASAE Fine		ASAE Fine to Medium
Type			Basic		
Drop Categories	#	Diam (um)	Frac	Diam (um)	Frac
	1	10.77	0.0013	10.77	0.0010
	2	16.73	0.0008	16.73	0.0003
	3	19.39	0.0012	19.39	0.0007
	4	22.49	0.0015	22.49	0.0003
	5	26.05	0.0025	26.05	0.0007
	6	30.21	0.0035	30.21	0.0010
	7	35.01	0.0040	35.01	0.0010
	8	40.57	0.0048	40.57	0.0020
	9	47.03	0.0082	47.03	0.0033
	10	54.50	0.0140	54.50	0.0053
	11	63.16	0.0210	63.16	0.0067
	12	73.23	0.0288	73.23	0.0090
	13	84.85	0.0362	84.85	0.0133
	14	98.12	0.0470	98.12	0.0223
	15	113.71	0.0597	113.71	0.0330
	16	131.73	0.0707	131.73	0.0393
	17	152.79	0.0863	152.79	0.0480
	18	177.84	0.1033	177.84	0.0647
	19	205.84	0.0953	205.84	0.0830
	20	238.45	0.0860	238.45	0.1147
	21	276.48	0.0867	276.48	0.1283
	22	320.60	0.0827	320.60	0.1380
	23	372.18	0.0623	372.18	0.1127
	24	430.74	0.0347	430.74	0.0640
	25	498.91	0.0238	498.91	0.0440
	26	578.54	0.0168	578.54	0.0317
	27	670.72	0.0112	670.72	0.0203
	28	777.39	0.0047	777.39	0.0093
	29	900.61	0.0005	900.61	0.0010
	30	1044.42	0.0003	1044.42	0.0007
	31	1210.66	0.0002	1210.66	0.0003

--Nozzle Distribution--		----------Current-----------				----------Default-----------			
Boom Length (%)					76.3				
Nozzle DSD & Locations	#	DSD	H(ft)	V(ft)	F(ft)	DSD	H(ft)	V(ft)	F(ft)
	1	1	-16.5	0	0	1	-18.7	0	0
	2	1	-15.5	0	0	1	-17.79	0	0
	3	1	-14.5	0	0	1	-16.87	0	0
	4	1	-13.5	0	0	1	-15.96	0	0
	5	1	-12.5	0	0	1	-15.05	0	0
	6	1	-11.5	0	0	1	-14.14	0	0
	7	1	-10.5	0	0	1	-13.22	0	0
	8	1	-9.5	0	0	1	-12.31	0	0
	9	1	-8.5	0	0	1	-11.4	0	0
	10	1	-7.5	0	0	1	-10.49	0	0
	11	1	-6.5	0	0	1	-9.58	0	0
	12	1	-5.5	0	0	1	-8.66	0	0
	13	1	-4.5	0	0	1	-7.75	0	0
	14	1	-3.5	0	0	1	-6.84	0	0
	15	1	-2.5	0	0	1	-5.93	0	0
	16	1	-1.5	0	0	1	-5.02	0	0
	17	1	-0.5	0	0	1	-4.1	0	0
	18	1	0.5	0	0	1	-3.19	0	0
	19	1	1.5	0	0	1	-2.28	0	0
	20	1	2.5	0	0	1	-1.37	0	0
	21	1	3.5	0	0	1	-0.456	0	0
	22	1	4.5	0	0	1	0.456	0	0
	23	1	5.5	0	0	1	1.37	0	0
	24	1	6.5	0	0	1	2.28	0	0
	25	1	7.5	0	0	1	3.19	0	0
	26	1	8.5	0	0	1	4.1	0	0
	27	1	9.5	0	0	1	5.02	0	0
	28	1	10.5	0	0	1	5.93	0	0
	29	1	11.5	0	0	1	6.84	0	0
	30	1	12.5	0	0	1	7.75	0	0
	31	1	13.5	0	0	1	8.66	0	0
	32	1	14.5	0	0	1	9.58	0	0
	33	1	15.5	0	0	1	10.49	0	0
	34	1	16.5	0	0	1	11.4	0	0

--Swath--	----------Current-----------	----------Default-----------
Swath Width	60 ft	
Swath Displacement	0.3702 x Swath Width	
Half Boom	No	

--Spray Material--	----------Current-----------	----------Default-----------
Name	Parathion 8 EC	Water
Type	User-defined	Basic
Nonvolatile Rate (lb/ac)	5	0.501
Active Rate (lb/ac)	0.4007	0.2505
Spray Volume Rate (gal/ac)	2	2
Specific Gravity	1	
Evaporation Rate (µm²/deg C/sec)	84.76	

--Meteorology--	----------Current-----------	----------Default-----------
Wind Speed (mph)	5	10
Wind Direction (deg)	-90	
Temperature (deg F)	86	
Relative Humidity (%)	50	

--Transport--	----------Current-----------	----------Default-----------
Flux Plane (ft)	2500	0

--Terrain--	----------Current-----------	----------Default-----------
Surface Roughness (ft)	0.3	0.0246

--Advanced--	----------Current-----------	----------Default-----------
Wind Speed Height (ft)	6.56	6.56
Max Compute Time (sec)	600	
Max Downwind Dist (ft)	5200	2608.24
Vortex Decay Rate (mph)	1.25	1.25
Aircraft Drag Coeff	0.1	
Propeller Efficiency	0.8	
Ambient Pressure (in hg)	29.91	29.91

Appendix B

Extrapolation Expressions

Table A1a: Extrapolation Expressions Gramoxone Extra
5 m/h wind speed

Gramoxone Extra Wind Speed @ 5 miles per hour				
Drop Size Class	"A"	"B"	R^2	Expression
Fine	11193	-0.997	0.9991	$y = 11193x^{-0.9971}$
Fine-Medium	4872	-1.025	0.9999	$y = 4872.1x^{-1.0251}$
Medium	4969	-1.088	0.9996	$y = 4968.9x^{-1.0875}$

Table A1b: Extrapolation Expressions Gramoxone Extra
10 m/h wind speed

Gramoxone Extra Wind Speed @ 10 miles per hour				
Drop Size Class	"A"	"B"	R^2	Expression
Fine	4816	-0.8782	0.9963	$y = 4815.5x^{-0.8782}$
Fine-Medium	2629	-0.9385	0.9925	$y = 2629.^{2x-0.9385}$
Medium	2382	-0.9792	0.9938	$y = 2382.2x^{-0.9792}$

Table A1c: Extrapolation Expressions Parathion 8 EC
5 m/h wind speed

Parathion 8 EC				
Wind Speed @ 5 miles per hour				
Drop Size Class	"A"	"B"	R2	Expression
Fine	3222	-1.0929	0.9963	$y = 3222.1x^{-1.0929}$
Fine-Medium	694	-1.0091	0.9925	$y = 693.5x^{-1.0091}$
Medium	899	-1.0126	0.9938	$y = 899.05x^{-1.1263}$

Table A1d: Extrapolation Expressions Parathion 8 EC
10 m/h wind speed

Parathion 8 EC				
Wind Speed @ 10 miles per hour				
Drop Size Class	"A"	"B"	R^2	Expression
Fine	7327	-1.1927	0.9983	$y = 7327.3x^{-1.1927}$
Fine-Medium	1970	-1.1455	0.9956	$y = 1969.7x^{-1.1455}$
Medium	2755	-1.2647	0.9953	$y = 2755x^{-1.2647}$

Appendix C
Ground Deposition

An additional review of the model was conducted for each of the sample products, Parathion 8 EC and Gramoxone® Extra.

The model output for the two products used in the study was reviewed to evaluate the down wind ground deposition. The model output for each product was sorted by wind speed (5 or 10 miles per hour), distance downwind (500, 1,000, 2,500, 5,000, and 10,000 feet), and drop size distribution (fine, fine-medium, and medium). All major inputs are summarized in Table 1 of the Study Report.

The AgDRIFT® 2.0 model is only designed to predict the ground deposition to 5,000 feet from the down wind edge of the field. To extend the model's range the predicted depositions were extrapolated to 10,000 feet using the procedure similar to air concentration profiles in the primary study. However, the deposition profile was best fit with the exponential function shown below.

For each case, the ground deposition was extrapolated to 10,000 feet using an exponential function of the form:

$$Y = a^* e^{-bX}$$

where: Y is the expected ground deposition
X is the distance down wind from the field edge
a and b are constants developed for each case.

Figures 1a, 2a, 3a, and 4a illustrate this procedure for each of the two products and the two wind speed (5 and 10 miles per hour) combinations.

The model predictions are summarized in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this appendix. Each table has three parts:

Part "a", lists the deposition as fraction of the applied rate. For example, if the intended application was 0.5 pounds per acre and the predicted fraction of applied is 0.01at 500 feet down wind, then the deposition at 500 feet from the edge of field is 1 percent of the application rate or 0.005 pounds per acre.

Part "b" lists the absolute deposition in mg/cm^2 based on the modeled use rates (Gramoxone Extra = 0.74 pounds per acre and Parathion 8 EC = 0.4 pounds per acre).

Part "c" lists the Deposition Expression Coefficients used to extrapolate the deposition profiles to 10,000 feet.

In addition to the tables, Figures 1b, 2b, 3b and 4b compare the relative deposition for the three drop-size distributions for the four total product and wind speed combinations.

The figures and table show that the deposition near the field (500 ft) can be as much as five percent for a fine drop-size spray. However, at longer distances from the field edge, and when applied with a fine-medium or fine drop-size spray the deposition is expected to be less than 1/100th of one percent of the application rate.

Table 1a Down Wind Deposition Gramoxone Extra 5 miles/hour
Deposit Expressed as Fraction of the Application.

Gramoxone Extra --- 5 miles per hours wind speed			
Ground Deposition Fraction of Applied			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	0.04080	0.01670	0.01200
1500	0.01040	0.00400	0.00266
2500	0.00042	0.00135	0.00097
5000	0.00049	0.00013	0.00010
10000	0.00002	0.00001	0.00001

Table 1b Down Wind Deposition Gramoxone Extra 5 miles/hour
Deposit Expressed in mg/cm^2

Gramoxone Extra --- 5 miles per hours wind speed			
Ground Deposition ($mg/cm^{2)}$			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	3.35E-04	1.37E-04	9.85E-05
1500	8.54E-05	3.28E-05	2.18E-05
2500	3.45E-06	1.11E-05	7.96E-06
5000	4.02E-06	1.07E-06	8.21E-07
10000	1.65E-07	6.86E-08	4.96E-08

Table 1c Down Wind Deposition Gramoxone Extra 5 miles/hour
Deposition Expression Coefficients

Deposition Expression Coefficients Gramoxone Extra Wind Speed @ 5 miles per hour				
Drop Size Class	"A"	"B"	R^2	Expression
Fine	0.05990	-0.00100	0.9690	$y = 0.0599e^{-0.001x}$
Fine-Medium	0.02490	-0.00110	0.9603	$y = 0.0249e^{-0.0011x}$
Medium	0.01800	-0.00110	0.9575	$y = 0.018e^{-0.0011x}$

Figure 1a Example ---Ground Deposition Extrapolation Method for Gramoxone Extra 5 miles/hour, Fine Drop Size Distribution.



Figure 1b Comparison ---Ground Deposition for Gramoxone Extra at 5 miles/hour, Fine Fine-Medium and Medium Drop Size Distribution.



Table 2a Down Wind Deposition Parathion 8 EC 5 miles/hour
Deposit Expressed as Fraction of the Application.

Parathion 8 EC --- 5 miles per hours wind speed			
Max Air Concentration ng/l (ppt)			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	0.01867	0.00662	0.00469
1500	0.00336	0.00110	0.00073
2500	0.00130	0.00045	0.00027
5000	0.00018	0.00006	0.00003
10000	0.00010	0.00003	0.00002

Table 2b Down Wind Deposition Parathion 8 EC5 miles/hour
Deposit Expressed in mg/cm^2

Parathion 8 EC --- 5 miles per hours wind speed			
Ground Deposition ($mg/cm^{2)}$			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	8.31E-05	2.95E-05	2.09E-05
1500	1.50E-05	4.90E-06	3.25E-06
2500	5.79E-06	2.00E-06	1.20E-06
5000	8.01E-07	2.67E-07	1.34E-07
10000	4.23E-07	1.47E-07	1.02E-07

Table 2c Down Wind Deposition Parathion 8 EC 5 miles/hour
Deposition Expression Coefficients

Deposition Expression Coefficients Parathion 8 EC Wind Speed @ 5 miles per hour				
Drop Size Class	"A"	"B"	R^2	Expression
Fine	0.0141	-0.0009	0.9832	$y = 0.0254e^{-0.0011x}$
Fine-Medium	0.0049	-0.0009	0.9867	$y = 0.0049e^{-0.0009x}$
Medium	0.0034	-0.0010	0.9846	$y = 0.0034e^{-0.001x}$

Figure 2a Example ---Ground Deposition Extrapolation Method for Parathion 8 EC 5 miles/hour, Fine Drop Size Distribution.



Figure 2b Comparison ---Ground Deposition for Parathion 8 EC at 5 miles/hour, Fine Fine-Medium and Medium Drop Size Distribution.



Table 3a Down Wind Deposition Gramoxone Extra 10 miles/hour
Deposit Expressed as Fraction of the Application.

Gramoxone Extra --- 10 miles per hours wind speed			
Ground Deposition Fraction of Applied			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	0.04800	0.02070	0.01540
1500	0.01900	0.00750	0.00530
2500	0.01030	0.00340	0.00250
5000	0.00180	0.00069	0.00048
10000	0.00002	0.00001	0.00001

Table 3b Down Wind Deposition Gramoxone Extra 10 miles/hour
Deposit Expressed in mg/cm^2

Gramoxone Extra --- 10 miles per hours wind speed			
Ground Deposition ($mg/cm^{2)}$			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	3.94E-04	1.70E-04	1.26E-04
1500	1.56E-04	6.16E-05	4.35E-05
2500	8.46E-05	2.79E-05	2.05E-05
5000	1.48E-05	5.66E-06	3.94E-06
10000	2.01E-07	8.76E-08	6.47E-08

Table 3c Down Wind Deposition Gramoxone Extra 10 miles/hour
Deposition Expression Coefficients

Deposition Expression Coefficients Gramoxone Extra Wind Speed @ 10 miles per hour				
Drop Size Class	"A"	"B"	R^2	Expression
Fine	0.07290	-0.00080	0.9510	$y = 0.0729e^{-0.0008x}$
Fine-Medium	0.03180	-0.00080	0.9336	$y = 0.0318e^{-0.0008x}$
Medium	0.02350	-0.00080	0.9304	$y = 0.0235e^{-0.0008x}$

Figure 3a Example ---Ground Deposition Extrapolation Method for Gramoxone Extra 10 miles/hour, Fine Drop Size Distribution.



Figure 3b Comparison ---Ground Deposition for Gramoxone Extra at 10 miles/hour, Fine Fine-Medium and Medium Drop Size Distribution.



Table 4a Down Wind Deposition Parathion 8 EC 10 miles/hour
Deposit Expressed as Fraction of the Application.

Parathion 8 EC --- 10 miles per hours wind speed			
Max Air Concentration ng/l (ppt)			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	0.0449	0.0181	0.0129
1500	0.0058	0.0020	0.0013
2500	0.0022	0.0007	0.0004
5000	0.0006	0.0002	0.0001
10000	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000

Table 4b Down Wind Deposition Parathion 8 EC 10 miles/hour
Deposit Expressed in mg/cm^2

Parathion 8 EC --- 10 miles per hours wind speed			
Ground Deposition ($mg/cm^{2)}$			
Distance downwind (ft)	Drop Size Distribution Class		
	Fine	Fine - Medium	Medium
500	2.00E-04	8.05E-05	5.74E-05
1500	2.56E-05	8.68E-06	5.79E-06
2500	9.57E-06	2.98E-06	1.87E-06
5000	2.80E-06	9.79E-07	5.79E-07
10000	2.73E-07	8.40E-08	5.70E-08

Table 4c Down Wind Deposition Parathion 8 EC 10 miles/hour
Deposition Expression Coefficients

Deposition Expression Coefficients Parathion 8 EC Wind Speed @ 10 miles per hour				
Drop Size Class	"A"	"B"	R^2	Expression
Fine	0.0091	-0.0005	0.9808	$y = 0.0091e^{-0.0005x}$
Fine-Medium	0.0028	-0.0005	0.9659	$y = 0.0028e^{-0.0005x}$
Medium	0.0019	-0.0005	0.9655	$y = 0.0019e^{-0.0005x}$

Figure 4a Example ---Ground Deposition Extrapolation Method for Parathion 8 EC 10 miles/hour, Fine Drop Size Distribution.



Figure 4b Comparison ---Ground Deposition for Parathion 8 EC at 10 miles/hour, Fine Fine-Medium and Medium Drop Size Distribution.



APPENDIX B

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON REDUCING EXPOSURES TO PESTICIDE

APPENDIX B

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON REDUCING EXPOSURES TO PESTICIDES

- Citizen's Guide to Pest Control and Pesticide Safety
  http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/Publications/Cit_Guide/citguide.pdf

- Pesticides and Child Safety
  http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/childsaf.htm

- Protecting Children from Pesticides
  http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/kidpesticide.htm

- Integrated pest management for agriculture.
  http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/food/ipm.htm

- Pesticides in Indoor Air of Homes - General
  http://ace.orst.edu/info/npic/factsheets/air_gen.pdf

Tips to Protect Children from Pesticide and Lead Poisonings around the Home
http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/10_tips/

1. Always store pesticides and other household chemicals, including chlorine bleach, out of children's reach -- preferably in a locked cabinet.

2. Always read directions carefully because pesticide products, household cleaning products, and pet products can be "dangerous" or ineffective if too much or too little is used.

3. Before applying pesticides or other household chemicals, remove children and their toys, as well as pets, from the area. Keep children and pets away until the pesticide has dried or as long as is recommended on the label.

4. If your use of a pesticide or other household chemical is interrupted (perhaps by a phone call), properly reclose the container and remove it from children's reach. Always use household products in child-resistant packaging.

5. Never transfer pesticides to other containers that children may associate with food or drink (like soda bottles), and never place rodent or insect baits where small children can get to them.

6. When applying insect repellents to children, read all directions first; do not apply over

cuts, wounds or irritated skin; do not apply to eyes, mouth, hands or directly on the face; and use just enough to cover exposed skin or clothing, but do not use under clothing.

7. To minimize track-in from outdoor treated areas, remove your shoes before you enter the home or use an outdoor shoe cleaning device prior to entering the home, and limit pet access to treated areas (http://ace.orst.edu/info/npic/factsheets/air_gen.pdf).